MEDICAL WOMEN.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,

FOR

OLIPHANT, ANDERSON, & FERRIER.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

MEDICAL WOMEN

A THESIS AND A HISTORY.

I.

Medicine as a Profession for Women.

II.

The Medical Education of Women.

I. THE BATTLE IN EDINBURGH.
II. THE VICTORY WON.

BY

SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE, M.D.,

MEMBER OF THE IRISH COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS;
LECTURER ON HYGIENE AT THE LONDON SCHOOL OF MEDICINE FOR WOMEN;
ATTENDING MEDICAL OFFICER AT THE
EDINBURGH HOSPITAL AND DISPENSARY FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

EDINBURGH:
OLIPHANT, ANDERSON, & FERRIER.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.
1886.

[*All Rights Reserved.*]

Dedicated

TO

DR. LUCY SEWALL,

FROM WHOSE DAILY LIFE I FIRST LEARNED

WHAT INCALCULABLE BLESSINGS

MAY BE CONFERRED ON THE SICK AND SUFFERING OF HER OWN SEX

BY A NOBLE AND PURE-MINDED WOMAN

WHO IS ALSO

A THOROUGHLY SCIENTIFIC PHYSICIAN.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

—o—

THE first edition of this book has now been out of print for some years, and repeated applications have been made to me by booksellers and others for a second edition. It was, however, manifestly impossible to issue this without bringing the history of events down to the present time, and more pressing duties have repeatedly obliged me to delay the execution of this project. Even now the work has been accomplished only with considerable difficulty, in the intervals available in the course of a busy professional life; and I trust that this circumstance will be remembered by critics, who can, no doubt, only too easily find defects that might have been avoided if a greater measure of "learned leisure" had been at my disposal.

I have made it my single object in this volume to give as complete and comprehensive a view as brevity would allow of the whole question of medical practice by women, and of the history of the movement in this country.

It may be thought by some that I have dwelt at disproportionate length on the details of the struggle in Edinburgh, and in particular have spared too much room in the Notes to quotations from the opinions and literature of the hour. I have, however, done so deliberately, not only because I believe the events recorded to be of the class that truly "make history," but because I am very anxious to submit to the public as full a narrative as possible, and am content to abide by their judgment whether or no the so-called "failure in Edinburgh" was due in whole or in part (as some have endeavoured to maintain) either to the errors, or to the "*lâches*," of those who carried on the warfare. My own opinion is that, properly speaking, there was no "failure;" I believe that it was the seed sown in tears in Edinburgh that was reaped in joy elsewhere. It is my firm

conviction, that in view of the then prevalent attitude of the profession, and the undeveloped state of public opinion at large, it was absolutely requisite that the battle should be fought out somewhere, and that no more passive policy would have secured (at any rate for many years) the results that have now been won. On this and other points, however, the judgment of the next generation may perhaps be more conclusive than our own, for the smoke of battle may well obscure to some extent the vision of the combatants.

I have taken a very considerable amount of additional trouble in order to give reference and authority, as far as possible, for all statements that may by any possibility be disputed, and I trust that I have so far succeeded in doing this that any reader having access to the newspapers, pamphlets, and other papers and books referred to, might, without reading a line of my book, reconstruct for himself a story almost identical with that which I have told.

To ensure even more fully the absolute accuracy of the history relating to the "Battle in Edinburgh," I have submitted it in proof to no less than seven persons,—four women and three men,—who were all on the spot at the time of the struggle, and not only had intimate knowledge of its details from day to day, but to a very considerable extent themselves "*quorum magna pars fuerunt.*" It is a matter of great satisfaction to myself, and may perhaps be so to my readers, that no one of them has found even the slightest error in my statement, though I am bound to confess that one of them (a very eminent medical man) expressed his opinion that I had in some respects "considerably softened the facts." I am glad to believe that, if guilty of error on either side, it has not been on the side of exaggeration.

SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE, M.D.

20th April 1886,
BRUNTSFIELD LODGE, EDINBURGH.

I.

Medicine as a Profession for Women.

REPRINTED, WITH ALTERATIONS AND LARGE ADDITIONS,
FROM "WOMAN'S WORK AND WOMAN'S CULTURE."

—o—

"We deny the right of any portion of the species to decide for another portion, or any individual for another individual, what is and what is not their "proper sphere." The proper sphere for all human beings is the largest and highest which they are able to attain to. What this is cannot be ascertained without complete liberty of choice."

—Mrs. J. S. Mill.

"You misconceive the question like a man,
Who sees a woman as the complement
Of his sex merely. You forget too much
That every creature, female as the male,
Stands single in responsible act and thought,
As also in birth and death.

. . . . . .

———I would rather take my part
With God's Dead, who afford to walk in white,
Yet spread His glory, than keep quiet here
And gather up my feet from even a step
For fear to soil my gown in so much dust.
I choose to walk at all risks."

—*Aurora Leigh.*

MEDICINE AS A PROFESSION FOR WOMEN.

> "The universe shall henceforth speak for you
> And witness, She who did this thing, was born
> To do it ; claims her licence in her work.
> And so with more works. Whoso cures the plague,
> Though twice a woman, shall be called a leech."
>
> —*Aurora Leigh.*

It is a very comfortable faith to hold that "whatever is, is best," not only in the dispensations of Providence, but in the social order of daily life ; but it is a faith which is perhaps best preserved by careful avoidance of too much enquiry into facts. The theory, if applied to past as well as to present times, would involve us in some startling contradictions, for there is hardly any act, habit, or custom which has not been held meritorious and commendable in one state of society, and detestable and evil in some other. If we believe that there are eternal principles of right and wrong, wisdom and equity, far above and greater than the "public opinion" of any one age or country, we must acknowledge the absolute obligation of enquiring, whenever matters of importance are at stake, on what grounds the popular opinions rest, and how far they are the result of habit, custom, and prejudice, or the real outgrowth of deep convictions and beliefs inherent in the

most sacred recesses of human nature. While the latter command ever our deepest reverence, as the true "vox populi, vox Dei," nothing can be more superficial, frivolous, and fallacious than the former.

In a country where precedent has so much weight as in England, it doubly behoves us to make the distinction, and, while gratefully accepting the safeguard offered against inconsiderate and precipitate change, to beware that old custom is not suffered permanently to hide from our eyes any truth which may be struggling into the light. I suppose that no thinking man will pretend that the world has now reached the zenith of truth and knowledge, and that no further upward progress is possible; on the contrary, we must surely believe that each year will bring with it its new lesson; fresh lights will constantly be dawning above the horizon, and perhaps still oftener discoveries will be re-discovered, truths once acknowledged but gradually obscured or forgotten will emerge again into day, and a constantly recurring duty will lie before every one who believes in life as a responsible time of action, and not as a period of mere vegetative existence, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

The above considerations arise naturally in connexion with the subject of this paper, which is too often set aside by the general public, who, perhaps, hardly appreciate its scope, and are not yet fully aroused to the importance of the questions involved in the general issue. We are told so often that nature and custom

have alike decided against the admission of women to the medical profession, and that there is in such admission something repugnant to the right order of things, that when we see growing evidences of a different opinion, among a minority perhaps, but a minority which already includes many of our most earnest thinkers of both sexes, and increases daily, it surely becomes a duty for all who do not, in the quaint language of Sharpe, "have their thinking, like their washing, done out," to test these statements by the above principles, and to see how far their truth is supported by evidence.

In the first place, let us take the testimony of Nature in the matter. If we go back to primeval times, and try to imagine the first sickness or the first injury suffered by humanity, does one instinctively feel that it must have been the *man's* business to seek means of healing, to try the virtues of various herbs, or to apply such rude remedies as might occur to one unused to the strange spectacle of human suffering? I think that few would maintain that such ministration would come most naturally to the man, and be instinctively avoided by the woman; indeed, I fancy that the presumption would be rather in the other direction. And what is such ministration but the germ of the future profession of medicine?

Nor, I think, would the inference be different if we appealed to the actual daily experience of domestic life. If a child falls down-stairs, and is more or less

seriously hurt, is it the father or the mother (where both are without medical training) who is most equal to the emergency, and who applies the needful remedies in the first instance? Or again, in the heart of the country, where no doctor is readily accessible, is it the squire and the parson, or their respective wives, who are usually consulted about the ailments of half the parish? Of course it may be said that such practice is by no means scientific, but merely empirical, and this I readily allow; but that fact in no way affects my argument that women are *naturally* inclined and fitted for medical practice. And if this be so, I do not know who has the right to say that they shall not be allowed to make their work scientific when they desire it, but shall be limited to merely the mechanical details and wearisome routine of nursing, while to men is reserved all intelligent knowledge of disease, and all study of the laws by which health may be preserved or restored.

Again, imagine if you can that the world has reached its present standing-point, that society exists as now in every respect but this,—that the art of healing has never been conceived as a separate profession, that no persons have been set apart to receive special education for it, and that in fact empirical "domestic medicine," in the strictest sense, is the only thing of the kind existing. Suppose now that society suddenly awoke to the great want so long unnoticed, that it was recognized by all that a scientific knowledge of the human frame in health and in disease, and a

study of the remedies of various kinds which might be employed as curative agents, would greatly lessen human suffering, and that it was therefore resolved at once to set apart some persons who should acquire such knowledge, and devote their lives to using it for the benefit of the rest of the race. In such case, would the natural idea be that members of each sex should be so set apart for the benefit of their own sex respectively, —that men should fit themselves to minister to the maladies of men, and women to those of women,—or that one sex only should undertake the care of the health of all, under all circumstances? For myself, I have no hesitation in saying that the former seems to me the *natural* course, and that to civilized society, if unaccustomed to the idea, the proposal that persons of one sex should in every case be consulted about every disease incident to those of the other, would be very repugnant; nay, that were every other condition of society the same as now, it would probably be held wholly inadmissible. I maintain that not only is there nothing strange or unnatural in the idea that women are the fit physicians for women, and men for men; but, on the contrary, that it is only custom and habit which blind society to the extreme strangeness and incongruity of any other notion.

I am, indeed, far from pretending, as some have done, that it is morally wrong for men to be the medical attendants of women, and that grave mischiefs are the frequent and natural results of their being placed in

that position. I believe that these statements not only materially injure the cause they profess to serve, but that they are in themselves false. In my own experience as a medical student, I have had far too much reason to acknowledge the honour and delicacy of feeling habitually shown by the gentlemen of the medical profession, not to protest warmly against any such injurious imputation.[1] I am very sure that in the vast majority of cases the motives and conduct of medical men in this respect are altogether above question, and that every physician *who is also a gentleman* is thoroughly able, when consulted by a patient in any case whatever, to remember only the human suffering brought before him and the scientific bearing of its details ; for, as was said not very long ago by a most eminent London surgeon, "Whoever is not able, in the course of practice, to put the idea of sex out of his mind, is not fit for the medical profession at all." It will, however, occur to most people that the medical man is only one of the parties concerned, and that it is possible that a difficulty which may be of no importance from his scientific standpoint, may yet be very formidable indeed to the far more sensitive and delicately-organized feelings of his patient, who has no such armour of proof as his own, and whose very condition of suffering may entail an even exaggerated condition of nervous susceptibility on such points.[2] At any rate, when we hear so many assertions about natural instincts

[1] See *Note A.* [2] See *Note B.*

and social propriety, I cannot but assert that their evidence, such as it is, is wholly for, and not against, the cause of women as physicians for their own sex.

If we take next the ground of custom, I think the position of those who would oppose the medical education of women is far less tenable than is generally supposed; for "We are apt to forget how recent a thing is the exclusive appropriation of the medical art by men. In ancient poetry, whether classic or Teutonic, as well as in mediæval romance, the woman is almost invariably the leech."[1] Indeed, a recent writer stated no more than the truth when he asserted that the "obloquy which attends innovation belongs to the men who exclude women from a profession in which they once had a recognized place."[2] I believe that few people who have not carefully considered the question from an historical point of view have any idea of the amount of evidence that may be brought to support this view of the case.[3]

Referring to the earliest classical times, we find distinct mention in the *Iliad* of a woman skilled in the science of medicine,[4] and a similar reference occurs also

[1] *Guardian*, Nov. 3, 1869. [2] *Athenæum*, Sept. 28, 1867.

[3] In his *Essai sur les Femmes*, Thomas points out that "Chez la plupart des sauvages . . . la médecine et la magie sont entre les mains des femmes."

[4] The passage is thus rendered by Professor Blackie:

> "His eldest born, hight Agamede, with golden hair,
> A leech was she, and well she knew all herbs on ground that grew."
> —*Iliad*, xi. 739.

In his Notes the translator remarks that "it seems undeniable that women have a natural vocation for exercising certain branches of the medical

in the *Odyssey*.[1] Euripides is no less valuable a witness on this point. He describes Queen Phædra[2] as disturbed in mind and out of health, and represents the nurse as thus addressing her: "If thy complaint be anything of the more secret kind, here are women at hand to compose the disease. But if thy distress is *such as may be told to men*, tell it, that it may be reported to the physicians;" thus indicating a prevailing public opinion that there were natural and rigid limits to the medical attendance of men on women, and that therefore some women were specially trained to do what the regular physicians must leave undone. It is at least remarkable to find such evidence of general feeling on this matter in a state of society supposed to possess much less delicacy and refinement than our own.

We find records of several Grecian women who were renowned for their medical skill, among whom may be instanced Olympias of Thebes, whose medical learning is said to be mentioned by Pliny; and Aspasia, from whose writings on the diseases of women, quotations are preserved in the works of Aetius, a Mesopotamian physician.[3] On the authority of Hyginus rests the history of Agnodice, the Athenian maiden whose skill and success

profession with dexterity and tact. . . . It is gratifying therefore to find that a field of activity which has been recently claimed for the sex . . . finds a precedent in the venerable pages of the *Iliad*. . . . In fact, nothing was more common in ancient times than medical skill possessed by females," in proof of which assertion he mentions Œnone and others.—Professor Blackie's *Homer and the Iliad*.

[1] *Odyssey*, iv. 227.

[2] Hippolytus, 293–7.

[3] Finauer's *Allgemeines Verzeichniss gelehrten Frauenzimmer*.

in medicine was the cause of the legal opening of the medical profession to all the free-born women of the State.[1]

In more modern times, when almost all learning was garnered into the religious houses, which were not only the libraries but the hospitals of the day, it seems

[1] I subjoin as a curiosity the quaint version of this story that is given in a letter from Mrs. Celleor (a fashionable midwife of the reign of James II.), published in 1687, and now to be found in the British Museum. After saying that "Among the subtle Athenians a law at one time forbade women to study or practise medicine or physick on pain of death, which law continued some time, during which many women perished, both in child-bearing and by private diseases, their modesty not permitting them to admit of men either to deliver or cure them," she continues, "till God stirred up the spirit of Agnodice, a noble maid, to pity the miserable condition of her own sex, and hazard her life to help them; which to enable herself to do, she apparelled her like a man, and became the scholar of Hierophilos, the most learned physician of the time; and having learned the art, she found out a woman that had long languished under private diseases, and made proffer of her service to cure her, which the sick person refused, thinking her to be a man; but, when Agnodice discovered that she was a maid, the woman committed herself into her hands, who cured her perfectly; and after her many others, with the like skill and industry, so that in a short time she became the successful and beloved physician of the whole sex." When her sex became known to the public, "she was like to be condemned to death for transgressing the law . . . which, coming to the ears of the noble women, they ran before the Areopagites, and the house being encompassed by most women of the city, the ladies entered before the judges, and told them they would no longer account them for husbands and friends, but for cruel enemies that condemned her to death who restored to them their health, protesting they would all die with her if she were put to death. . . . This caused the magistrates to disannul the law, and make another, which gave gentlewomen leave to study and practise all parts of physick to their own sex, giving large stipends to those that did it well and carefully. And there were many noble women who studied that practice, and taught it publicly in their schools as long as Athens flourished in learning."

evident that the care of the sick and wounded fell at least as often to the share of the nunneries as of the monasteries, and probably medical skill, such as it was, found place among the sisters quite as often as among the brethren of the various religious Orders.

The old ballad of Sir Isumbras gives one illustration out of many of the prevailing state of things, relating how the nuns received the wounded knight, and how—

> "Ilke a day they made salves new,
> And laid them on his wounds,
> They gafe hym metis and drynkes lythe,
> And heled the knyghte wonder swythe." [1]

It may be remembered that Sir Walter Scott,[2] after describing how Rebecca "proceeded with her own hands, to examine and bind up the wounds," goes on to remark, "The youngest reader of romances and romantic ballads must recollect how often the females, during the dark ages, as they are called, were initiated into the mysteries of surgery. . . . The Jews, both male and female, possessed and practised the medical science in all its branches."

Beaugrand states that the most ancient document extant relative to the organization of surgery in France, forbids the practice of surgeons *and of female surgeons* who had failed to pass a satisfactory examination before the proper authorities (1311). References to female surgeons appear again in an edict of King

[1] *Thornton Romances*, Camden Society. [2] *Ivanhoe*, chap. xxviii.

John in 1352, and it thus appears that women practised at that time with full legal authority.[1]

In the fourteenth century, when the Medical School of Salerno enjoyed high reputation, we find record of a female physician named Abella, who lived there and wrote in Latin various works on Medicine.[2]

Early in the next century an Italian lady, Dorotea Bocchi, was actually Professor of Medicine at the University of Bologna;[3] and among the traditions of the same University is preserved the name of Alessandra Gigliani, who, in even earlier times, was a learned student of anatomy.[4]

In the sixteenth century, at Alcarez in Spain, lived Olivia Sabuco de Nantes, who "had a large knowledge of science and medicine," and whose medical works were printed at Madrid in 1588.[5]

It is clear that in Great Britain at an early period women were commonly found among the irregular practitioners of Medicine; and it is equally clear that their male competitors greatly desired to deprive them of the right to practise. In 1421 a petition was represented to Henry V., praying that "no women use the practyse of fisyk under payne of long emprisonment."[6] Within a few years after

[1] *Early Practice of Medicine by Women*, by Professor Bolton, *Journal of Science*, January 1881.

[2] *Nuovo Dizionario Istorico*, Bassano, 1796.

[3] Fachini's *Prospetto Biografico delle Donne Italiane*, Venezia, 1824.

[4] Medici's *Scuola Anatomica di Bologna.* [5] Finauer.

[6] *New York Medical Gazette*, April 24, 1869.

the first incorporation of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, an Act[1] was passed for the relief and protection of "Divers honest psones, *as well men as women*, whom God hathe endued with the knowledge of the nature, kind, and operaçon of certeyne herbes, rotes, and waters, and the using and ministering them to suche as be payned with customable diseases, for neighbourhode and Goddes sake, and of pitie and charytie," because the "Companie and Fellowship of Surgeons of London, mynding onlie their owne lucres and nothing the profit or ease of the diseased or patient, have sued, vexed, and troubled" the aforesaid "honest psones," who were henceforth to be allowed to "practyse, use, and mynistre in and to any outwarde sore, swelling, or disease, any herbes, oyntements, bathes, pultes, or emplasters, according to their cooning experience and knowledge . . . without sute, vexation, penaltie, or losse of their goods."[2]

This provision clearly referred to general practice other than that of midwifery, which latter branch of the profession was then, as for centuries both before and after, almost exclusively in the hands of women. The very word *midwife*, with its Latin synonym "*obstetrix*," is sufficiently significant on this point,

[1] 34 Henry VIII. 8.

[2] Maitland, in giving an account of the foundation of the Edinburgh College of Physicians in 1681, begins by saying that "The Practice of Physick had been greatly abused in Edinburgh by foreign Imposters, Quacks, Empirics, and illiterate Persons, *both men and women*."
—Maitland's *History of Edinburgh*, 1753.

for in neither language has it any masculine equivalent, and the clumsy term "Man-midwife" served, when first needed and used, to mark the general sense of what the writer in the *Athenæum* forcibly calls "masculine intrusion into that which natural instinct assigns to woman as her proper field of labour;" and this same very suggestive title is the only one which at the present day, in legal phraseology, distinguishes the male practitioners of this branch of medical art.

From the time of Moses onwards, this part of the profession has always been mainly in the hands of women, and in many countries of Europe no other usage has ever prevailed. The first regular French medical society, "La confrairie de St. Cosme and St. Damien," included within its organization the Company of Midwives,[1] and from that time down to the present it seems in France to have been the custom to give to these women a regular education, terminating in sufficient examinations, an example which England would have done well to follow.

A large amount of very interesting information about the history and position of midwives in this country was published a few years ago by Dr. Aveling, and from it I shall proceed to make some extracts; but I advise every reader interested in the matter to refer to

[1] The statutes of 1268 ordained that "les matrones ou sages femmes sont aussi de la dite confrairie et subjects ausdits deux chirurgiens jurez du Roy au Chastelet, qui ont dressé certains statuts et ordonnances tant pour les droicts de la confrairie que pour leur estat de sage femme, u'elles doivent observer et garder."—Du Breul's *Antiquités de Paris*, 1639.

the much fuller records contained in the volume itself, though I cannot by any means agree with some of the writer's conclusions.[1]

The first English midwife of whom we find an account is Margaret Cobbe, who had a yearly salary of £10 from the Crown in 1469. In 1470, she attended the queen of Edward IV. at the birth of his son and heir; and, in 1473, we find special provision made for her rights and privileges in an Act of Parliament which was enacted, "Provided alwey that this Acte . . . extend not nor in any wise be perjudiciall to Margery Cobbe . . . beying midwif to our best beloved wyf, Elizabeth, Queen of England."

In 1503, Alice Massy received a salary of £10 as midwife to Elizabeth of York, queen of Henry VII.

About this time, the doings of the midwives seem to have much exercised the minds of the Episcopal Bench. In 1554, Bishop Bonner expressly ordains that "a mydwyfe shall not use or exercise any witchcrafte, charmes," etc. During a Visitation in 1559, enquiry is made "Whether you know anye that doe use charmes, sorcery, . . . or imaginatoris invented by the Devyl, specially in the tyme of women's travyle." In 1591, at St. Mary's, Lichfield, there was an entry that a child had been "baptized by the mydwyfe, and not yet broughte to ye Churche to be examined." The Archbishop of York, in view of such contingencies, expressly provides that "Item: All curates must openly in the

[1] *English Midwives*, by J. H. Aveling, M.D. J. & A. Churchill, 1872.

church teach and instruct the mydweifes of the very words and form of baptisme." In 1567, the Archbishop of Canterbury granted a licence to Eleanor Pead, midwife, and required her to take a long oath to fulfil her duties faithfully; and among other things she bound herself to use the proper words at baptism, and moreover to "use pure and clean water, and not any rose or damask water."

About this time attention seems to have been called to the ignorance and incapacity of many midwives, and it is curious to find that one great obstacle to improvement in their education was the idea that it was highly improper that matters relating to midwifery should be printed in the vulgar tongue, lest men and boys should read them![1] What, I wonder, would the modest matrons of the sixteenth century think of our present arrangements!

In 1547, Andrew Boorde, in his *Breviary of Health*, wishes to institute examinations for midwives, to be conducted jointly by "the Byshoppe and a doctor of physick;" and in 1616, Dr. Peter Chamberlen proposes that "some order may be settled by the State for the instruction and civil government of midwives." A generation later his son "attempted, *in direct opposition to the wishes of the College of Physicians*, to

[1] "Many think it is not meete ne fitting such matters to be intreated of so plainly in our mother and vulgar language, to the dishonoure (as they say) of womanhood, and the derision of their own secrets by the detection and discovering whereof *men it reading* shall be moved thereby . . . every boy and knave reading them as openly as the tales of Robin Hood." —*The Birth of Mankynde*, translated out of Latin, 1540.

obtain from the Crown authority to organize the female practitioners in that department into a company, with himself at their head as president and examiner." He complains bitterly that the bishops, in licensing midwives, cared only for their oath and their money; and that, "taking this oath and paying their money, with the testimonie of two or three gossips, any may have leave to be ignorant, if not as cruel, as themselves. . . . But of instruction or order among the midwives, not a word."

In 1637, a book of instruction, *The Expert Midwife*, was translated from the Latin, *anonymously*, the prejudice against such publications being still extremely strong. A few years later, however, works on midwifery were published by Dr. Harvey (1653), and by Dr. Sermon (1671). Dr. Willughby, also, "son of Sir Percival Willughby of Wollaton," not only wrote on midwifery, but trained his own daughter as a skilled midwife, and we find her in practice with her father in London in 1658. Some idea of the extremely strong feeling then existent against man-midwifery may be gathered from the curious account of a case attended by Miss Willughby, when, special difficulties having arisen, she desired her father's help, and he relates that "At my daughter's request, unknown to the lady, I crept into the chamber upon my hands and knees, and returned, and it was not perceived by the lady."[1]

[1] Traditions are still current in Edinburgh that at a much later period (1780 to 1800), the services of Dr. Hamilton, Professor of Midwifery in the University, were obtained on more than one occasion in a similarly clandestine manner.

Another instance is also recorded by Dr. Aveling, where a midwife arranged that "A chirurgeon should be called in, provided that the patient might not see him, being fearful lest she should die with apprehension and shame, . . . the room being darkened on that side, . . . so that it be concealed from the woman all her life long, nor that she see the chirurgeon any more."

The first book on midwifery written by a midwife was *The Midwife's Book*, published in 1671 by Mrs. Jane Sharp, "a practitioner in the art of midwifery above thirty years." She expressly complains that it may be thought "women cannot attain so rarely to the knowledge of things as men may, who are bred up in universities," and have access to teaching in anatomy, from which women are debarred; but argues that "the art of midwifery chiefly concerns us, which even the best learned men will grant, . . . they are forced to borrow from us the very name they practise by—'man-midwives.'"

What really seems to have been the cause of transferring the practice of midwifery from women to men, was the invention of the midwifery forceps by Peter Chamberlen, and the idea fostered by male practitioners that "a surgical instrument must be controlled by the hand of a surgeon." We know now that high authority declares a perfect surgeon to have "an eagle's eye, a lion's heart, and *a lady's hand*," so that the instruments in question might have been (and subsequently were often) wielded quite as efficiently by

women as by men;[1] but this was at any rate not the view of the male surgeons of that day (nor, apparently, of Dr. Aveling himself), and so, all surgical training being jealously denied to women, it was inevitable that they should be forced by degrees to take rank as inferior practitioners.

In 1760, a spirited protest was published by a midwife named Mrs. Nihell, who declares her "insuppressible indignation at the errors and pernicious innovations, . . . sillily fostering a preference of men to women in the practice of midwifery; a preference first admitted by credulous fear, . . . upon this so suspicious recommendation of those interested to make that fear subservient to their selfish ends."

It is impossible to give more space to this very interesting subject. I trust I have made it clear that midwives formerly held a most respectable position in this country, and lost it because they were denied the opportunities of needful study and instruction.

A curious idea of their importance, their duties, and their credit, may be gathered from a MS. volume (without date) now preserved in the British Museum.[2] which was evidently written at a time when hardly any but women were employed in the "mysteries of

[1] "Pour ce qui est de la pratique de la chirurgerie, regardez et touchez les mains des maîtres de l'art; *ce sont les mains de femmes;* elles en ont la souplesse et la dexterité."—*Revue Scientifique*, le 12 Fev. 1876.

[2] "*The Midwive's Deputie* . . . composed for the use of my wife (a sworne Midwife), by Edward Poeton, Petworth, Licentiate in Physick and Chyrurgery."

the profession," and when it was a comparatively rare thing, that needed to be specially advised in certain cases, for them to "make use of (*i.e.* call in) a physitien." The writer remarks that "it is meet that the midwife be a woman well read and well experienced," and gives a caution that "drunkenness is a sordid sin in any who use it, but is a blemish worthy greater blame in ministers, magistrates, midwives, physitiens, and chirurgeons."

Mrs. Celleor, in her letter previously referred to,[1] tells us that in 1642, "the physitiens and chirurgeons contending about it, midwifery was adjudged a chirurgical operation, and midwives were licensed at Chirurgeon's Hall, but not till they had passed three examinations before six skilful midwives and as many chirurgeons;" but for some reason (connected probably with their occasional baptismal functions) the midwives were, in 1662, referred for their licence to Doctors' Commons, thus losing their official connexion with the medical world.

How it came that English midwives fell gradually from their high estate is partly explained by a very public-spirited book (with the appropriate motto "Non sibi sed aliis") written by a surgeon in 1736.[2] The writer adverts to the accusations of ignorance then brought against the midwives, and remarks that "the only method by which this fatal distemper can

[1] "Letter to Dr. ——" written by Elizabeth Celleor, "from my house in Arundel Street, Strand, Jan. 16, 1687–8."

[2] "*A Short Account of the State of Midwifery in London.* By John Douglas, Surgeon. Dedicated to the Right Hon. Lady Walpole."

be cured, is to put in the power of midwomen to qualify themselves thoroughly and at a moderate expense. . . . To which method of qualifying themselves I doubt not the midwomen will object, and say that they would readily be at any reasonable expense and fatigue to be so thoroughly instructed, but it is not in their power. The midwomen cannot, and the midmen will not instruct them. The midmen will object and say that the midwomen want both capacity and strength (instruct them as ye please). To which I reply (*'ore rotundo plenis buccis'*) that it is not want of capacity, docility, strength, or activity . . . which is evident to a demonstration from the successful practice of women in the Hotel Dieu at Paris (the best school for midwifery now in Europe). . . . Would not any person then be deservedly laughed at who should assert that our women are not as capable of performing their office had they the same instruction as the French women?" This chivalrous surgeon then proposes that regular provision should be made for proper instruction, and for examinations by two surgeons (who have lectured to the women), "and six or seven other persons appointed by His Majesty, because I don't think it reasonable that so many people's bread should depend on the humour and caprice of two men only;" adding, that: "If some such scheme was put in execution, I'm satisfied that in a very few years there would not be an ignorant midwife in England, and consequently the

great agonies most women suffer at the very sight of a man would be almost entirely prevented, and great expense and much life saved."

However, we must suppose that these noble words of protest fell upon deaf ears, and the midwives being left in their ignorance, their practice gradually passed into the hands of the medical men, who had every advantage of learning at their command.[1]

It is, however, only very recently that men-midwives have been allowed to attend on royal patients in this country; indeed, I believe that the Princess Charlotte was the first to establish the precedent, and that our present Sovereign was the first queen who followed it.

In addition to the midwives already mentioned as attendant on royalty, we have also Alice Dennis, who attended Anne of Denmark, and received a fee of £100 "for her pains and attendance upon the Queen, as of His Highness's free gift and reward, without account, imprest, or other charge to be set on her for the same." We learn also that Margaret Mercer was sent express from England in 1603 to attend on "His Majesty's dearest daughter, the Princess Electress Palatine." It is also recorded that "Mrs. Labany attended Mary

[1] It may be interesting to give the following quotation on this subject from a popular magazine of forty years ago:—"The accoucheur's is a profession nearly altogether wrested out of the hands of women, for which Nature has surely fitted them, if opinion permitted education to finish Nature's work. But women are held in the bonds of ignorance, and then pronounced of deficient capacity, or blamed for wanting the knowledge they are sternly prevented from acquiring."

—*Tait's Magazine*, June 1841.

of Modena, Queen of James II., when she was delivered, on June 10th, 1687, of James Francis Edward, afterwards called the Pretender."[1] Mrs. Wilkins, another midwife, seems also to have been present on this occasion, and it is stated that each of these persons received a fee of five hundred guineas for her services. Mrs. Kennon was midwife to Queen Caroline, consort of George II., and she also attended the Princess of Wales when George III. was born. Mrs. Draper officiated at the birth of George IV. Indeed, it is well known that Queen Charlotte was always attended by a woman,[2] and the late Duchess of Kent employed the Frau von Siebold, of whom mention is made elsewhere.[3]

Mrs. Stephen, who usually attended Queen Charlotte, wrote *The Domestic Midwife*, which is characterized by Dr. Aveling as "perhaps the best book upon the subject written by any woman in our own language."

[1] It will be remembered that an attempt was made to throw doubt on the birth of this prince, but Dr. Aveling remarks that "Dr. Chamberlen, in his letter to the Princess Sophia, showed the absurdity of this hypothesis"—(*i.e.* of the charge of conspiracy).

[2] "Delicacy had in those days so far the ascendancy, that the obstetrical art was principally practised by females, and on this occasion the Queen was delivered by Mrs. Stephen, Dr. Hunter being in attendance among the ladies of the bedchamber, in case of his professional assistance being required."—Huish's *Life of George IV.*

[3] "It is a curious coincidence, considering the future connection of the children, that Madam Siebold, the accoucheuse spoken of above as attending the Duchess of Coburg at the birth of Prince Albert (August 1819), had only three months before attended the Duchess of Kent at the birth of the Princess Victoria."—*Early Years of Prince Consort.*

She taught her pupils thoroughly the principles of anatomy, and the use of obstetric instruments, and protested against giving women a less complete education than men in such matters. She also wrote "I cannot help thinking that so general an use of men in the business of a midwife has introduced a far greater number of evils among society than it has prevented. Ladies have been induced to dispense with that delicacy which was their greatest ornament. . . . It has been alleged that women's understanding does not admit of receiving such knowledge as is necessary in the practice of midwifery. *I only wish that those who teach midwifery would give them as clear a knowledge of that science as they are capable of receiving.*"

In point of fact, the idea of employing medical men in midwifery has only become general within the present century. An Edinburgh medical man tells me that when such attendance was proposed to his grandmother some eighty years ago, she not only promptly declined it, but declared the suggestion to be "simply indecent."

Now that public attention is awaking to the subject, and educated women are once more desirous of undertaking this peculiarly womanly work, we may indeed anticipate, with the already quoted writer in the *Athenæum*, that a reactionary movement will soon make itself felt, and that the usage "which even up to the present time a large proportion of our English families, especially those of our northern towns and outlying country districts, have never adopted, will

most likely be discontinued in all classes of English society before the end of the present century."

On the Continent of Europe, owing to their better education, the midwives retain much of the position that they have for a time lost in England; and we hear that in Russia "a medical man is very rarely called in; notwithstanding, fatal cases are of far less frequent occurrence in Russia than in England;" and the same authority tells us that ladies practising midwifery are admitted into society as doctors would be, and are well paid, both by the Government and by private fees.[1]

While thus briefly tracing out the history of midwifery in modern times, and the causes which led to its practice passing from the hands of women into those of men, I have not paused to mention, in due chronological order, those women who, in the last three centuries, have been distinguished for a knowledge of the other branches of medicine and surgery. Of these I will now enumerate a few, though my time and space are far too limited either to give a complete list, or to relate any but the most prominent particulars of each case mentioned; but I can promise that any one who will consult the authorities quoted will be abundantly repaid by the long and interesting details that I am forced to pass over in almost every instance.

In the seventeenth century, in England, one of the

[1] *Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church*, by Madame Romanoff. Rivingtons, 1868.

women most noted for medical skill was Lady Ann Halket,[1] born in 1622, daughter of the then Provost of Eton College. "Next to the study of Divinity she seems to have taken most delight in those of Physick and Surgery, in which she was no mean proficient; nay, some of the best physicians in the kingdom did not think themselves slighted when persons of the greatest quality did consult her in their distempers, even when they attended them as their ordinary physicians. Many from England, Holland, and the remotest parts of the kingdom, have sent to her for things of her preparing; and many whose diseases have proved obstinate under all the methods of physicians, have at length, by the physicians' own advice, been recommended and sent to her care, and have been recovered by her."

In 1644 was born Elizabeth Lawrence, afterwards wife of the Rev. Samuel Bury, of Bristol, who wrote her life,[2] and who bears witness that "it was not possible there should be a more observant, tender, indulgent, and compassionate wife than she was; a more sympathizing spirit is very rarely found." He records that "she took much pleasure in Anatomy and Medicine, being led and prompted to it partly by her own ill-health, and partly with a desire of being useful." The difficulties that she encountered in her studies may be guessed, since "she would often regret

[1] Ballard's *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain.* Oxford, 1752.
[2] *Account of the Life and Death of Mrs. Elizabeth Bury.* Bristol, 1721.

that so many learned men should be so uncharitable to her sex, and be so loath to assist their feebler faculties when they were anywise disposed to an accurate search into things profitable and curious. Especially as they would all so readily own that souls were not distinguished by sexes. And therefore she thought it would have been an honourable pity in them to have offered something in condescension to their capacities, rather than have propagated a despair of their information to future ages." Her husband, however, tells us that "she improved so much, that many of the great masters of the Faculty have often been startled by her stating the most nice and difficult cases in such proper terms;" and, remarking that, "How much knowledge and skill soever she attained in the practice of Physick, by long observation, conversation, and experience, yet she was very distrustful of herself," he adds that the "instances of her successes in the preservation of human lives were not easily numbered."

As a contemporary of these Englishwomen, we find in Germany Elizabeth Keillen, who published several medical works, and died in 1699. She is said by Finauer to have had "great knowledge of medicine and chemistry."

In comparatively recent times, Bologna was remarkable as ever for its liberal encouragement of learned women, and about the middle of the last century the Chair of Anatomy at that University was filled by Anna Morandi Mazzolini, whose exquisitely delicate ana-

tomical models, executed in wax, became the pride of the Museum at Bologna. She first became interested in the study of Anatomy in consequence of her wish to help her husband, who was a distinguished anatomist, and a maker of anatomical designs and models. He fell into ill-health and mental despondency, and therefore "his wife, loving him dearly, and fearing that he would desist from his work, gave herself up to his comfort; and for this purpose became herself an anatomical sculptor, reading works of anatomy, consulting anatomical tables and preparations, taking theoretical and practical lessons from her husband, and, marvellous to say, even dissecting dead bodies with resolute mind, and with incredible perseverance. . . . Too long to describe are the works executed in wax by the able hands of this illustrious woman. They were collected in five elegant cases in our Anatomical Museum. . . . The fourth case encloses delicate illustrations of all the parts belonging to the senses of sight, smell, hearing, taste, and touch—stupendous works in which she surpassed herself, and also her husband, and his colleague, Ercole Lelli. . . . These models were for some time kept in her own house, and each one who saw them spread her renown, so that through distant countries was spread the fame of her works, so that every learned and distinguished person passing through Bologna was solicitous to visit and know personally the maker of these wonders."[1] Signora

[1] *Scuola Anatomica di Bologna*, by Medici.

Mazzolini also made original discoveries in anatomical science, which obtained for her many marks of distinction from the learned colleges and societies of the day. She was offered a Chair at Milan, with increased revenues, but preferred to remain at Bologna, where she lived till her death in 1774. Medici, in his records of the Anatomical School of Bologna, speaks of this lady with profound respect, as distinguished alike by "rare powers, great erudition, gracious manners, and delicate and gentle temperament," and relates that her fame reached the ears of the Emperor Joseph II., who visited her in 1769, and "having seen her works and heard her conversation," loaded her with public honours. Her example seems to have inspired others of her countrywomen to follow in the steps of one so honoured, alike in the stern duties of her profession, and in the sanctities of household life; for in the course of the next half century several Italian women availed themselves of the thorough medical education which the Italian Universities never refused.

In 1788, Maria Petraccini[1] took a degree in medicine at Florence, and we find her, a little later, lecturing on anatomy at Ferrara, in presence of the medical professors. She married Signor Feretti, and has left several works on the physical education of children.

Her daughter, Zaffira Feretti, seems to have inherited her mother's talents, for she studied Surgery in the University of Bologna, and there received a medical

[1] Fachini.

degree[1] in May 1800. She obtained an appointment under the Italian Government, and for some time lived in Ancona acting as Director-General of the midwives in all parts of the country. She afterwards went to Turkey, and died at Patras in 1817.

Maria Mastellari seems also to have been a woman of unusual talent, and "progressed diligently in the most rigid sciences." She obtained a medical degree at Bologna in 1799. She subsequently became the wife of Signor Collizoli-Sega, and is described as possessing a "sweet and gentle temperament, with special love of silence and quiet. She centred her interests in her family, which she managed admirably."[2]

Still more distinguished in the annals of medicine was Maria delle Donne, who also studied in the University of Bologna, and "received the doctoral laurel" in 1806.[3] She "constantly practised both Medicine and Surgery," and was appointed by Napoleon Bonaparte to the Chair of Midwifery at Bologna. The *Gazette Medicale*, quoting from the *Raccoglitore Medico*, gives the following account of her :—"Anna Maria delle Donne, docteur en médecine, auteur d'élégants vers latins, professeur d'obstetrique à l'Université de Bologna, membre de l'Academie, bénédictine, etc., est décedée le 9 Janvier, 1842. Cette femme distinguée qui a succedé à Madame Mazzolini et à Madame Bassi, est une des gloires scientifiques de Bologna. Elle soutint en 1800, avec un très grand

[1] Fachini. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

succès, une thèse de Philosophie, de Chirurgie, and de Médecine. Peu après, à la suite d'un examen public, on lui conféra le grade de docteur et de consultant. Napoleon en passant à Bologne fut frappé du savoir de cette dame, et institua pour elle une Chaire d'Obstetrique, où elle se fit une grande renommée." [1]

We have several instances of degrees granted to women in the Middle Ages by the Universities of Bologna, Padua, Milan, Pavia, and others; the earliest instance that I have found being that of Betisia Gozzadini,[2] who was made Doctor of Laws by the University of Bologna in 1209. We have also at Bologna,—Maddalena Buonsignori, Professor of Laws, 1380; Laura Bassi, Professor of Philosophy, 1733; Maria Gaetana Agnesi, Professor of Mathematics, 1750; Clothilde Tambroni, Professor of Greek, 1794; and also other instances in various Italian Universities.

In Germany also several such instances have occurred. Early in this century, Frau von Siebold so greatly distinguished herself in the practice of midwifery that the degree of M.D. was conferred on her by the University of Giessen; [3] and her daughter Marianne, afterwards Frau von Heidenreich, studied in the Universities of both Göttingen and Giessen, and took her degree in the regular way in 1817. She is spoken of as "one of the most famed and eminent female scholars of Germany," and as being "universally

[1] *Gazette Medicale*, du 10 Janvier 1846.

[2] Ghirardacci, *Historia Bologna*, 1605.

[3] Klemm, *Die Frauen.*

honoured as one of the first living authorities in her special branch of science."[1] She died only in 1859.

In France the name of Madame Lachapelle[2] was known and honoured as that of one of the ablest teachers of midwifery during the latter part of the last century. She has left several valuable works on subjects connected with her specialty. Her funeral, in 1821, was followed by all the chief physicians of Paris. Her pupil and successor, Madame Boivin,[3] was still more distinguished for her medical knowledge and skill, and for her contributions to anatomical science. Her *Mémoire de l'art des Accouchements* was approved by the highest medical authority, and was appointed as the text-book for students and midwives by the Minister of the Interior. She was invested with an Order of Merit by the King of Prussia in 1814, and in the same year was appointed co-director (with the Marquis de Belloy) of the General Hospital for Seine and Oise, and in 1815 was entrusted with the direction of a temporary military hospital, for her services in which latter capacity she received a public vote of thanks. She was also entrusted with the direction of the Hospice de la Maternité, and of the Maison Royale de Santé, and was one of the most distinguished practitioners of the time. She made original discoveries in anatomy, invented various surgical instruments,

[1] *Athenæum*, July 1859.
[2] Arnault's *Biographie nouvelle des contemporains.*
[3] Querard's *Littérature Française.*

and obtained prizes for medical theses from the Société de Médecine.

Her medical writings were distinguished by "precision et clarté, jugement sain, érudition choisie, et savoir solide." In 1846 one of her books was eulogized by Jourdan as "ouvrage éminemment pratique, et le meilleur que nous possedions encore sur ce sujet," with the additional remark that "tout se réunit pour lui mériter une des premières places parmi les productions de la littérature médicale moderne." She was a member of the Medical Societies of Paris, Bordeaux, Berlin, Brussels, and Bruges, and was honoured with the degree of M.D. from the University of Marbourg. She died in 1841.

I do not know whether the University of France ever refused admission to a woman. When in Paris, in 1868, I found that Miss Mary Putnam of New York was quietly studying there with permission of the authorities, and as the fact seemed to me of enormous importance, I ventured to make formal inquiry on the subject, and received the following answer from the Secretary to the Minister of Public Instruction :—

"*Paris, le* 18 *Août* 1868, *Ministère de l'Instruction Publique.*

"MADEMOISELLE,—En réponse à la lettre que vous me faites l'honneur de m'adresser, en vous recommendant du nom de Lord Lyons, qui a écrit pour vous à Mons. le Ministre, je m'empresse de vous faire savoir que le Ministre est disposé à vous autoriser, aussi que les autres dames Anglaises, qui se destineraient à la médecine, à faire vos études à la Faculté de Paris et a y subir des examens.

"Il est bien entendu que vous devez être munie, par voie d'équivalence ou autrement, des diplômes exigés pour l'inscription à la faculté de médecine.

"Agréez, Mademoiselle, l'assurance de mon respect,

(Signed) "DANTON."

The first graduate in Paris was our distinguished countrywoman, Miss Garrett, who, after passing the five examinations required, received her degree in June 1870. The *Lancet* records that "her friends must have been highly gratified to hear how her judges congratulated her on her success, and to see what sympathy and respect was shown to her by all present." [1]

The next lady who graduated was Miss Mary C. Putnam, already mentioned, who, after quietly pursuing her studies (combined with original researches), like a second Archimedes, during both the sieges of Paris in 1870–71, took her degree with great honour in August 1871. The *Lancet* remarked: "Miss Putnam has just been undergoing the very strict examination for the doctor's degree in Paris, and has passed very creditably. This is the second case in the Paris Faculty, the innovation being made quietly, whilst elsewhere angry discussions intervene." [2]

At Lyons, also, two women obtained degrees in Arts, in 1861 and 1869 respectively. At Montpellier a degree in Arts was conferred on Antonia Cellarier in 1865, and three other women have taken it subsequently. The first woman who received the degree of M.D. at Montpellier was Miss Agnes M'Laren, of Edinburgh, in 1878. After graduation she remained another year at Montpellier, at the express desire of Professor Courty, as his assistant; and she sub-

[1] *Lancet*, June 18, 1870. [2] *Lancet*, August 26, 1871.

sequently by his wish translated one of his most important works.

For several years past the University of Zurich has been thrown open to women as freely as to men; a Russian woman, named Nadejda Suslowa, being the first to obtain a degree in Medicine, in 1867.

In 1870 the Swedish newspapers published in their official columns a royal decree, granting to Swedish women the right to study and practise Medicine, and ordaining that the professors of the Universities should make arrangements for teaching and examining them in the usual way.[1]

Even Russia seems in advance of England in this matter. In 1869: "The Medico-Chirurgical Academy of St. Petersburg conferred the degree of M.D. upon Madame Kaschewarow, the first female candidate for this honour. When her name was mentioned by the Dean, it was received with an immense storm of applause, which lasted for several minutes. The ceremony of investing her with the insignia of her dignity being over, her fellow-students and colleagues lifted her upon a chair, and carried her with triumphant shouts through the hall."

At Moscow, also, "The Faculty of Medicine, with the full concurrence of the Council of the University of Moscow, have decided to grant to women the right of being present at the educational courses and lectures of

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette*, August 1870.
[2] *Medical Gazette*, New York, February 27, 1869.

the Faculty, and to follow all the labours of the Medico-Chirurgical Academy. The tests of capacity will be precisely the same as for male students." [1] Still more recently we hear from St. Petersburg that "the success of the lady physicians is encouraging other ladies to devote themselves to Medicine, and a considerable step has been made in this direction. . . . A person who interests herself in the higher education of women has requested the Minister of State to accept the sum of £8000, and to devote it to the establishment of medical classes for women at the Imperial Academy of Medicine." [2]

Nor is the progress of liberality less marked on the other side of the Atlantic. It is well known that several of the smaller medical schools in the United States admitted women as soon as they applied for instruction, but until 1869 no American University threw open its doors. About the end of that year, however, the State University of Michigan took the initiative in this matter, and the following statement was inserted in the official Calendar of 1871 : "Recognizing the equality of rights of both sexes to the highest educational advantages, the Board of Regents have made provision for the medical education of women, by authorizing a course of education for them, separate, but in all respects equal to that heretofore given to men only. The conditions of admission, as well as

[1] *British Medical Journal*, October 1871.
[2] *British Medical Journal*, May 18, 1872.

graduation, are the same for all." During the first year fourteen women appeared as students in the Faculty of Arts, three in that of Law, and thirteen were studying Medicine and Surgery. In the spring of 1871, Miss Sanford received the first medical degree granted to a woman by an American University; and it is worth notice that this lady (herself a pupil of Dr Lucy Sewall of Boston) took her place among the most distinguished graduates of the year: — her thesis on "Puerperal Eclampsia" being the one selected by the Medical Faculty for publication. The number of women studying at Michigan University during the session 1871–72 was sixty-eight, as compared with the thirty of the previous year.

So much for the historical evidence bearing on this question. I am indeed sorry to have paused so long on this part of the subject, but it seemed essential to a proper statement of the whole case.

If, then, nature does not instinctively forbid the practice of the healing art by women, and if it cannot be denied that some at least of its branches have long been in their hands, we must go further to seek on what grounds their admission to the medical profession should be opposed.

Probably the next argument will be that women do not require, and are not fitted to receive, the scientific education needful for a first-rate physician, and that "for their own sakes" it is not desirable that they should pursue some of the studies indispensably necessary.

To this the answer must be, that the wisest thinkers teach us to believe that each human being must be "a law unto himself," and must decide what is, and what is not, suitable for his needs; what will, and what will not, contribute to his own development, and fit him best to fulfil the life-work most congenial to his tastes. If women claim that they do need and can appreciate instruction in any or all sciences, I do not know who has the right to deny the assertion.

That this controversy is no new one may be proved by reference to a very curious black-letter volume now in the British Museum,[1] wherein the writer protests: "I mervayle gretely of the opynyon of some men that say they wolde not in no wyse that theyr doughters or wyves or kynneswomen sholde lerne scyences, and that it sholde apayre their cödycyons. This thing is not to say ne to sustayne. That the woman apayreth by connynge it is not well to beleve. As the proverbe sayeth, 'that nature gyveth maye not be taken away.'"

If it be argued that the study of natural science may injure a woman's character, I would answer, in the words of one of the purest-minded women I know, that "if a woman's womanliness is not deep enough in her nature to bear the brunt of any needful education, it is not worth guarding." It is, I think, inconceivable that any one who considers the study of natural science to be but another word for earnest and reverent inquiry into the works of God, and who believes that, in

[1] *The Boke of the Cyte of Ladyes*, by Christine Du Castel, 1521.

David's words, these are to be "sought out of all them that have pleasure therein," can imagine that any such study can be otherwise than elevating and helpful to the moral, as well as to the mental, nature of every student who pursues it in a right spirit. In the words of Scripture, "To the pure, all things are pure," and in the phrase of chivalry, "Honi soit qui mal y pense."

It has always struck me as a curious inconsistency, that while almost everybody applauds and respects Miss Nightingale and her followers for their brave disregard of conventionalities on behalf of suffering humanity, and while hardly any one would pretend that there was any want of feminine delicacy in their going among the foulest sights and most painful scenes to succour, not their own sex, but the other, many people yet profess to be shocked when other women desire to fit themselves to take the medical care of those of their sisters who would gladly welcome their aid. Where is the real difference? If a woman is to be applauded for facing the horrors of an army hospital, when she believes that she can there do good work, why is she to be condemned as indelicate when she professes her willingness to go through an ordeal, certainly no greater, to obtain the education necessary for a medical practitioner? Surely work is in no way degraded by being made scientific; it cannot be commendable to obey instructions as a nurse, when it would be unseemly to learn the reasons for them as a

student, or to give them as a doctor; more especially as the nurse's duties may lead her, as they did in the Crimea, to attend on men with injuries and diseases of all kinds, whereas the woman who practises as a physician would probably confine her practice to women only. It is indeed hard to see any reason of delicacy, at least, which can be adduced in favour of women as nurses, and against them as physicians.

Their natural capacity for the one sphere or the other is, of course, a wholly different matter, and is, indeed, a thing not to be argued about, but to be tested.[1] If women fail to pass the required examinations for the ordinary medical degree, or if, after their entrance into practice, they fail to succeed in it, the whole question is naturally and finally disposed of. But that is not the point now at issue.

That the most thorough and scientific medical education need do no injury to any woman, might safely be prophesied, even if the experiment had never been tried; but we have, moreover, the absolute confirmation of experience on the point, as I, for one, will gladly testify from personal acquaintance in America with many women who have made Medicine their profession; having had myself the advantage of studying under one who was characterized, by a medical gentleman known throughout the professional world, as "one of the best physicians in Boston," and who, certainly, was more remarkable for thorough refine-

[1] See *Note C.*

ment of mind than most women I know—Dr. Lucy Sewall.

Of course there may always be unfortunate exceptions, or rather there will always be those of both sexes who, whatever their profession may be, will be sure to disgrace it; but it is not of them that I speak, nor is it by such individual cases that the supporters of any great movement should be judged.

The next argument usually advanced against the practice of Medicine by women is, that there is no demand for it; that women, as a rule, have little confidence in their own sex, and had rather be attended by a man. That everybody had rather be attended by a competent physician is no doubt true; that women have hitherto had little experience of competent physicians of their own sex is equally true; nor can it be denied that the education bestowed on most women is not one likely to inspire much confidence. It is probably a fact, that until lately there has been "no demand" for women doctors, because it does not occur to most people to demand what does not exist; but that very many women have wished that they could be medically attended by those of their own sex, I am very sure, and I know of more than one case where ladies have habitually gone through one confinement after another without proper attendance, because the idea of employing a man was so repugnant to them. I have, indeed, repeatedly found that even doctors, not altogether favourable to the present movement,

allow that they consider men rather out of place in midwifery practice ;[1] and an eminent American practitioner once remarked to me that he never entered a lady's room to attend her in confinement, without wishing to apologize for what he felt to be an intrusion, though a necessary and beneficent intrusion, in one of his sex.

I suppose that the real test of "demand" is not in the opinions expressed by those women who have never even seen a thoroughly educated female physician, but in the practice which flows in to any such physician when her qualifications are clearly satisfactory. On this point I shall have something to say in a future page.

Of the Boston Hospital for Women and Children I can speak from lengthened experience in it as a student. When standing in its dispensary I have over and over again heard rough women of a very poor class say.

[1] "There is one subject in which I have long felt a deep and deepening concern. I refer to *man-midwifery*. . . . Nature tells us with her own voice what is fitting in these cases ; and nothing but the omnipotence of custom, or the urgent cry of peril, terror, and agony—what Luther calls *miserrima miseria*—would make her ask for the presence of a man on such an occasion, when she hides herself and is in travail. And, as in all such cases, the evil reacts on the men as a special class, and on the profession itself."—*Locke and Sydenham*, by Dr. John Brown.

"Nothing probably but the deadening force of habit, combined with the apparent necessity of the case, has induced us to endure that anomalous person against whose existence our language itself bears a perpetual protest—the man-midwife. And this single instance suggests a whole class of others in which the intervention of a man is scarcely less inappropriate."—*Guardian*, Nov. 3, 1869.

when questioned why they had not had earlier treatment for certain diseases, "Oh, I *could not* go to a man with such a trouble, and I did not know till just now that ladies did this work;" and from others have repeatedly heard different expressions of the feeling that, "It's so nice, isn't it, to be able at last to ask ladies about such things?"

As I am alluding to my own experience in this matter, I may perhaps be allowed to say how often in the same place I have been struck with the *contingent* advantages attendant on the medical care by women of women; how often I have seen cases connected with stories of shame or sorrow to which a woman's hand could far most fittingly minister, and where sisterly help and counsel could give far more appropriate succour than could be expected from the average young medical man, however good his intentions. Perhaps we shall find the solution of some of our saddest social problems when educated and pure-minded women are brought more constantly in contact with their sinning and suffering sisters, in other relations as well as those of missionary effort.

So far from there being no demand for women as physicians, I believe that there is at this moment a large amount of work actually awaiting them; that a large amount of suffering exists among women which never comes under the notice of medical men at all, and which will remain unmitigated till women are ready in sufficient numbers to attend medically to those

of their own sex who need them, and this in all parts of the world. I may quote the opinions expressed on this subject in 1867 in one of the most thoughtful of our English journals: "We heartily admit that the only way to discriminate clearly what practical careers women are, and are not, fitted for, is to let them try. In many cases, as in the medical profession, we do not feel any doubt that they will find a special kind of work for which they are specially fitted, which has never been adequately done by men at all, and which never would be done but by women. . . . We have heard the opinion of one of the most eminent of our living physicians, that one of the new lady physicians is doing, in the most admirable manner, a work which medical men would never even have had the chance of doing." [1]

I am told by Catholic friends that a great many cases of special disease remain untreated in convents, because the nuns, with their extreme notions of feminine seclusion, think that it would be little short of profanation to submit to some kinds of medical treatment from a man.[2] Indeed, it is expressly laid down by a great Catholic authority, St. Alphonsus,[3] that though monks and nuns are required to place themselves in the doctor's care when commanded to do so by their superiors, a special exception is to be made in the case of nuns suffering from certain maladies, who can only

[1] *Spectator*, April 13, 1867.

[2] See *Note D.*

[3] *Theologia Moralis*, by St. Alphonsus.

be required to accept treatment from a skilled woman, if any such be available; as, under existing circumstances, is so rarely the case. I do not ask any reader to applaud or even justify these poor nuns, if they, esteeming themselves "the martyrs of holy purity," sacrifice life to such scruples; but I do most emphatically ask, in the name of humanity, whether the state of things can be defended which may drive women, from the highest and most holy motives, to submit to the extremity of physical suffering and even death itself, because it is impossible for them to obtain the medical services of their own sex, and because they believe they can best fulfil the spirit of their vows by accepting no other?

I am informed by a friend that Archbishop Manning, when expressing to her his strong interest in the question of the medical education of women, alluded to facts like those referred to above, as affording one of the strongest motives for such interest in the minds of Catholics. Nor, surely, need sympathy in such a case be limited within the bounds of any religious denomination.

To pass to the consideration of other cases of a less exceptional kind, there can, I think, be little doubt that an enormous amount of preventible suffering arises from the unwillingness of very many girls on the verge of womanhood to consult a medical man on various points which are yet of vital importance, and to appeal to him in cases of apparently slight illness, which yet issue but

too often in ultimately confirmed ill-health. I firmly believe that if a dozen[1] competent women entered upon medical practice at this moment in different parts of England, they might, without withdrawing a single patient from her present medical attendant, find full and remunerative employment in attending simply to those cases which, in the present state of things, go without any adequate treatment whatever; for I know that many suffering women are quite willing to consult one of their own sex, if thoroughly qualified, when they refuse, except at some crisis of acute suffering, to call in a medical man.[2] Probably Queen Isabella of Castile was neither the first nor the last woman whose life was sacrificed to her modesty.[3] Even if such extreme instances are rare, I think it cannot be denied

[1] This was written in 1869, but I should, from my present experience (1886), substitute "hundred" for "dozen," and probably might with truth go much further.

[2] A curious coincidence occurred which may illustrate this feeling. While studying in Edinburgh, I was attacked in the newspapers for having alluded to this subject, and a certain doctor published three letters in one week to prove that "ninety-nine out of every hundred Englishwomen suffering from female diseases freely consulted medical men." During that very week no less than three women, in different classes of society, appealed to me for advice and treatment for sufferings about which they "did not like to ask a gentleman." In each case I advised them to consult a medical man, as I was not yet myself in practice, and there were no women doctors in Edinburgh; but in each case I found that their feeling in the matter was too strong to allow them to do so.

[3] "Concerning her death, it was magnanimous and answerable to the courage of heroes," etc.—*Gallerie of Heroick Women*, written in French by Pierre le Moyne, and translated by the Marquess of Winchester, 1652.

that very much needless pain, "and pain of a kind that ought not to be inflicted," is caused, especially to young girls, by the necessity of consulting men on all occasions, and I believe that those who know most of the facts insist most strongly on this point.

We constantly find incidental references to feelings of this kind both in ancient and modern times. Students of history will remember the curious protest in the will of the Duchess of Northumberland, mother of Lady Jane Grey (1555). "In no wise let me be opened after I am dead. I have not lived to be very bold afore women, much more wolde I be loth to come into the hands of any lyving man, be he physician or surgeon."[1] With reference to the present day, we have the following emphatic testimony from a veteran medical man, Dr. Mackenzie of Inverness:—"Every medical man must confess that he is often merely able to hint as to information he requires from his female patients, and consequently, for want of plain questions and answers, which a lady M.D. would at once ask and receive, frequently mistakes and mistreats a case. Having been a physician and surgeon for nearly fifty years, I state, as a thoroughly well-known undeniable fact, that great numbers of women are sickly for life, and die, simply because they shrink from speaking of their ailments to men."[2]

I do not know how far the medical profession at large

[1] Hare's *Walks in London*, vol. ii.
[2] *Inverness Courier*, March 16, 1871.

would acknowledge the truth of the above statement; it is probable that they are really less competent to judge about it than women are themselves; for, as an eminent divine remarked, that it was considered a point of politeness not to express theological doubts before a clergyman, it may probably be thought still more obligatory not to question the adequacy of the existing medical profession before one of its members. One can hardly imagine a lady sending for a doctor to tell him why she will *not* consult him; it is sufficient to know that many cases of disease among women go without treatment; it is surely open to any one at least to suggest the above as one of the possible reasons.

And indeed, if no such special suffering were often involved in the idea of consulting a man on all points, it seems self-evident that a woman's most natural adviser would be one of her own sex, who must surely be most able to understand and sympathize with her in times of sickness as well as of health, and who can often far more fully appreciate her state, both of mind and body, than any medical man would be likely to do.[1]

Nor can I leave the subject without expressing a hope that, when women are once practising medicine in large numbers, great gain may accrue to medical science from the observations and discoveries which their sex will give them double facilities of making among other women. One of the most eminent of the

[1] See *Note E.*

so-called "ladies' doctors" of the day writes: "The principal reason why the knowledge of diseases of women has so little advanced, is the hitherto undisturbed belief that one sex only is qualified by education and powers of mind to investigate and to cure what the other sex alone has to suffer."[1] After alluding to women physicians of both ancient and modern times, Dr. Tilt further remarks, that: "if well educated, they may greatly improve our knowledge of the diseases of women."

Moreover, there is reason to hope that women doctors may do even more for the health of their own sex in the way of prevention than of cure, and surely this is the very noblest province of the true physician. Already it is being proved with what eagerness women will attend lectures on physiology and hygiene when delivered to them by a woman, though perhaps not one in ten would go to the same course of lectures if given by a medical man. I look forward to the day when a competent knowledge of these subjects shall be as general among women as it now is rare; and when that day arrives, I trust that the "poor health" which is now so sadly common in our sex, and which so frequently comes from sheer ignorance of sanitary laws, will become rather the exception than, as now, too often, the rule. I hope that then we shall find far fewer instances of life-long illness entailed on herself by a girl's thoughtless ignorance; I believe we shall see a

[1] *Handbook of Uterine Therapeutics*, by Edward John Tilt, M.D.

generation of women far fitter in mind and body to take their share in the work of the world, and that the registrar will have to record a much lower rate of infantile mortality, when mothers themselves have learned to know something at least of the elementary laws of health. It has been well said, that the noblest end of education is to make the educator no longer necessary; and I, at least, shall think it the highest proof of success if women doctors can in time succeed in so raising the standard of health among their sister women, that but half the present percentage of medical practitioners are required in comparison to the female population.

Of course I do not expect that every reader will look at this question from my point of view, or will be able to arrive at the same conclusions respecting it. But I think that many who have never before seen the matter in the light in which I have tried to place it, will be ready to admit that there are at any rate *primâ facie* grounds for my argument, and that, allowing even for considerable over-statement on my part, there may still remain subject for serious consideration.

Even if I am wholly mistaken, and if all that needs doing could in England be effectually done by men, we have still, I think, no reason for the exclusion of women from the medical profession;—there is still no ground on which it can be right to refuse to every patient the power of election between a physician of her own sex and of the other, when women as well

as men are desirous of qualifying themselves for this work, seeing that it will after all be always a matter of choice; for we cannot suppose that the time will ever come when women will be arbitrarily prevented from employing men, as they have till recently been arbitrarily prevented from employing women, as their medical attendants.

It will be seen that many nations have, from the earliest period, recognized and acted upon the truth that "Mind is of no sex," and that, where this has not been the case in former times, the barriers are being rapidly and readily thrown down as civilization advances, till, in truth, Great Britain now stands almost alone in refusing to admit her daughters to most of the national universities, and in denying them the opportunity of proving experimentally whether "the male mind of the Caucasian race"[1] is indeed so immeasurably superior to its feminine counterpart. It may be remarked, by the bye, that it is very curious to notice how the very people who loudly maintain the existence of this vast mental disparity, are just those who strenuously resist every endeavour to submit their theory to the touchstone of experience, instead of welcoming the application of those tests that might be expected so triumphantly to prove their point! But, jesting apart,

[1] For a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole question, let me refer to Dr. Henry Bennet's letter, containing the above words, in the *Lancet* of June 18, 1870. An answer to it occurs in the *Lancet* of July 9, 1870, and is quoted in *Note C.*

the present state of things can hardly be agreeable to English self-respect; and it is to be hoped that our country will soon descend from her bad eminence, and no longer be marked out as the one land where men only can reap benefit from the educational advantages provided at the expense of the nation at large. It can hardly be an object of ambition to the learned men of any people to deserve the woe pronounced of old against those who "have taken away the key of knowledge, and them that were entering in, they hindered."

Many persons, however, who would gladly see women engage in the practice of Medicine, yet think it undesirable that they should obtain their education in the same schools as men; and here another practical point arises for consideration. If it is indeed true that no one is fit for the profession of Medicine unless able to banish from its practice the personal idea of sex, it certainly seems as if all earnest students seeking the same knowledge for the same ends ought to be able to pursue their studies together. We are constantly told (and I think rightly) that no women *need* object, when necessary, to consult a medical man on any point, because the true physician will see in it simply an impersonal "case," and will, from his scientific standpoint, practically ignore all that would be embarrassing as between persons of opposite sexes. If this is and ought to be true, it does not seem too much to demand equal delicacy of feeling among those who will in a year or two be themselves physicians; and, from personal ex-

perience, when studying in large American and Swiss hospitals with students of both sexes, I believe that no serious difficulty need ever occur, except in cases of really exceptional coarseness of character on one side or the other. That such joint study will be for the first few days novel and embarrassing is of course natural; but I believe that, as the first novelty wears off, the embarrassment too will disappear in the interest of a common study, and that no thoroughly pure-minded woman, with an ordinary amount of tact, need ever fear such association with students of whom the majority ought always to be gentlemen. It is of course a radically different thing to study any or all subjects with earnest scientific interest, and to discuss them lightly in common conversation.[1]

Not only in America has the system of joint education been tried, but at Paris, Zurich, and Bern, ladies are at the present moment studying in the regular medical schools, and friends at each place assure me of the complete success of the experiment, if such it is considered. Dr. Mary Putnam (the first lady ever admitted to the Parisian Medical School) in 1869 wrote thus: "There is not the slightest restriction on my studies or my presence at the classes. . . . I have never found the slightest difficulty in studying with the young men with whom I am associated, not only at lectures, but in the hospitals, reading-room, laboratory, etc. I have always been treated with a courtesy at once frank and

[1] See *Note F.*

respectful." A lady, studying Medicine at the University of Michigan in 1870, wrote : " We are very much pleased with the way in which we have been received here, both by professors and students ; they have treated us in every respect with great courtesy." Another lady, when studying at Zurich, reported that " in the Medical School of Zurich, no advantage which is afforded to the male students is denied to the women. Every class is open to them, and they work side by side with the men. The students have invariably been to me most friendly, helpful, and courteous." In answer to an official letter of enquiry, the Dean of the Medical Faculty at Zurich wrote : " Since 1867, ladies have been regularly admitted as matriculated students, and have been allowed all the privileges of *cives academici*. As far as our experience has gone, the new practice has not in any way been found to damage the interests of the University. The lady students we have hitherto had have all been found to behave with great good taste, and to be diligent students."

The testimony of Dr. Agnes M'Laren, who went through the full course of medical study at Montpellier, is no less emphatic on this point ; and I can bear personal testimony to the thoroughly wholesome indifference with which the presence of women was regarded at the University of Bern, when, in 1876, I went there to take the degree of M.D., which at that time was refused to women in this country. Swiss and German lads are certainly not supposed to be more

polished than those of our own country, but from first to last I never saw or heard an insolent act or word; all the students of both sexes seeming much more intent on getting through their medical studies, than on troubling themselves as to the personality of those who sat on neighbouring benches. So far as I could see, the men kept very much to themselves, and the women to themselves, and, except that the women's shorter stature was rather a disadvantge to them in seeing operations, etc., I saw little or nothing to remark in the thoroughly commonplace routine pursued at the "mixed classes," of which such a bugbear has been made in England and Scotland. Such evidence must surely carry more weight than the opinions of those who merely theorize about probabilities, especially when such theorists start, as is often the case, with a predisposition to find "lions in the way."[1]

If the admission of women to the regular medical schools has been proved to bring no evil consequences, wherever teachers and professors have shown good will, it needs strong arguments to justify their exclusion from advantages which they can hardly obtain elsewhere; for it has been well remarked, that nothing can be more false than to confound a "small injustice" with "injustice to a small number."

For myself, I cannot see why difficulties that have in France and Switzerland been proved chimerical, should in England be supposed (without any fair trial) to be

[1] See *Note G.*

insurmountable ; as I, for one, cannot believe that less good and gentlemanly feeling should be expected from English and Scotch students, *wherever their professors set them an example of courtesy*, than is found among the undergraduates of foreign universities.

But this is a point which I do not greatly care to urge ; although medical science can undoubtedly be most favourably studied under those conditions which only large institutions can command, and which could for many years be only with difficulty and at much greater expense attained in a medical college designed for women only. Still there is no doubt that women, thoroughly in earnest, and with a certain amount of means at their command, *can* obtain adequate medical instruction without entering any of the existing schools for men,and I shall subsequently show that arrangements have already been made to secure all that is necessary with much less effort and expense than formerly. We should be very thankful to have the universities and medical schools thrown open to us, to be allowed some share in the noble provision made, chiefly with public money, for the instruction of medical students ; but this is not absolutely indispensable. The really essential point is that women should be admitted to the same examinations as men, and this goal, which seemed far off when first this essay was published in 1869, has now (1886) been successfully attained.

The change effected in these seventeen years has indeed been enormous. In the beginning of 1869 there

were literally no means of medical instruction or examination open to women, and though that year seemed to promise a better future, the hopes then awakened were doomed to premature extinction. The state of things is now very different. It will, however, be more convenient to defer to a subsequent page a general statement of the present condition of affairs, and of the opportunities both of education and of examination that have been thrown open to women since these pages were first published.

I hope in the next paper to give a brief but comprehensive account of the main features of the struggle for the medical education of women in this country, and of the vicissitudes experienced before the victory was practically won. In every such struggle there is a period of extreme difficulty, when success seems well-nigh hopeless; but when once that success is attained, there is, I think, a tendency to forget how hard was the battle, and how strong the forces marshalled against the cause of progress. For the encouragement of those who have to undertake similar conflicts in future, it may be worth while that some record should be kept of this contest, as otherwise it is more than probable that a few years hence we may be told that no one ever objected to the admission of women to the medical profession!

I am anxious, therefore, that the story should be written as fully as necessary brevity will allow, while most of those concerned are still living, and can

challenge or confirm my statements. I do not think that any of those who took part in the struggle, or any of their more immediate friends and helpers, will find fault with my narrative,—unless, indeed, it is on account of the inevitable omission of many minor details, which would have no doubt still more fully emphasized the broad facts, but which time and space forbid me to include. I doubt whether any written record can place fully before those who knew nothing of Edinburgh at the time all the bitterness of the last four years of the struggle, when we found ourselves forced to combine the incessant labours of the student (usually in themselves considered a quite sufficient burden) with the constant vigilance of the soldier in time of war; and to be ready alike to proceed with our daily work in the class-room, and to defend ourselves in newspaper columns, or on the platform, from every kind of misrepresentation, and under every form of obloquy, with occasional supplementary appearances in Courts of law![1] There may no doubt have been some who honestly doubted whether women possessed the mental and physical strength necessary for the study

[1] *The Examiner* (quoted in *Scotsman* of January 24, 1871) thus put the case: "We are told that the Jews on returning from captivity began to rebuild their temple in the midst of very disheartening opposition: they carried a trowel in one hand and a sword in the other. The ladies who have gone to Edinburgh to qualify themselves as medical practitioners find themselves in a like unsatisfactory position. They have to divide their attention between the platform and the study, and so, to speak, have to fight all day to get an hour's quiet reading at night."

and practice of Medicine, but to us it seemed as if we should indeed find ourselves on a bed of roses when allowed to limit our labours and anxieties to those falling fairly within the compass of our profession ;—to obtain bare "leave to toil" was a different and far harder matter. Looking back on those times of struggle, of which I think some of us will bear the marks all our days, I feel even more strongly than I did then that nothing could have carried us through years of such unceasing labour, and such desperately acrimonious conflicts, but the conviction, that I know was strong in many of us, that we were fighting a true battle for liberty against tyranny, for the powers of light against the powers of darkness.

"Good cheer, faint heart! Though all look dark,
Though few men know, each leaves his mark.
So each must struggle, straight and stark,
In this world's great fraternity.
For every passing glimpse of thought,
Fleeting, perhaps, and scarcely caught,
Shows where some battle's being fought,
A landmark in eternity.

Soul against soul in life's short span
We strive, yet only work this plan,—
He that made each and every man,
Not scorning a minority,—
Glory in pain—respect to foe—
And shame on rancour when we know
That each man works and strikes his blow
With God for his authority."

"Roots."

II.

Medical Education of Women.

I.—THE BATTLE IN EDINBURGH.

"When from the Throne of God, that Throne where the weary have refuge,
Where, in the midst of distress, there is calm, that mandate is uttered,—
Mandate not uttered alone that day for the thousands of Judah,
But to all ages addressed, and to all generations,—'Go Forward.'
Forward, when all seems lost, and the cause looks utterly hopeless;
Forward, when brave hearts fail, and to yield is the rede of the coward;
Forward, when friends fall off, and enemies gather around thee;
Thou, though alone with thy God, alone in thy courage, Go Forward!
Nothing it is to Him to redeem or by few or by many;
Help, though deferred, shall arrive; ere morn the night is at darkest."

—Neale's "Egypt."

MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

I. THE BATTLE IN EDINBURGH.

> "When free thoughts, like lightnings, are alive,
> And in each bosom of the multitude,
> Justice and Truth, with Custom's hydra brood,
> Wage silent war."
>
> SHELLEY.

IF, then, we start with the assumption that women may, with profit to themselves and to the community, become practitioners of medicine, it is clear that they must, in the first place, secure such an education as shall make them thoroughly competent to take their share of responsibility in the care of the national health; and, secondly, that they must obtain this education in accordance with the regulations prescribed by authority, so that they may be recognised by the State as having conformed to all its legal requirements, and may practise on terms of perfect equality with other qualified practitioners.

It is essential to the thorough comprehension of this last point, that the laws regulating medical practice in this country should be clearly understood, as these could never be lost sight of by those who were engaged in the battle which I now hope to describe, and I will,

before proceeding further, endeavour to state clearly the provisions of the Medical Act of 1858. For the protection of the public against ignorant and mischievous quacks, the Act provided that no person should be recognized as a legally-qualified practitioner of medicine in the United Kingdom unless registered in a Register appointed to be kept for that purpose. The Act provided that all persons possessing the degree of M.D. from any foreign or colonial University, and already practising in this country at the date of the passing of the Act, should be entitled to be so registered; but that, with this exception (and a curious one in favour of those on whom the doctorate had been conferred by the Archbishop of Canterbury), no medical practitioners could demand registration unless holding a licence, diploma, or degree, granted by one of the British Examining Boards specified in the schedule attached to the Act. It is, of course, self-evident that these provisions were intended solely to defend the public against incompetent practitioners; and though it is perhaps to be regretted that the Act did not expressly require the Medical Council to examine, and, on proof of competency, to register, the holders of foreign diplomas, and all others who had pursued a regular course of medical study, it could not be anticipated that any great injustice would be done by the omission of any such a clause; and still less, assuredly, was it intended by this Act to secure to one sex a monopoly of all medical practice. But there is no doubt that for a

time the Act was wrested from its original purpose, and made an almost insurmountable barrier to the admission of women to the authorized practice of medicine; and this because the Act made it obligatory on all candidates to comply with certain conditions, and yet left it in the power of the Medical Schools, collectively, arbitrarily to preclude women from such compliance.

The following clauses of the Act of 1858 will show the absolute necessity for the registration of all practitioners of respectability:—

. . . "After January 1, 1859, the words 'legally qualified Medical Practitioner,' or 'duly qualified Medical Practitioner,' or any words importing a Person recognised by Law as a Medical Practitioner, or Member of the Medical Profession, when used in any Act of Parliament, shall be construed to mean a Person registered under this Act. . . .

"After January 1, 1859, no Person shall be entitled to recover any Charge in any Court of Law for any Medical or Surgical Advice, Attendance, or for the Performance of any Operation, or for any Medicine which he shall have both prescribed and supplied, unless he shall prove upon the Trial that he is registered under this Act. . . .

"After January 1, 1859, no Certificate required by any Act now in force or that may hereafter be passed, from any Physician, Surgeon, Licentiate in Medicine and Surgery, or other Medical Practitioner, shall be valid unless the Person signing the same be registered under this Act.

"Any Person who shall wilfully and falsely pretend to be, or take or use the Name or Title of a Physician, Doctor of Medicine, Licentiate in Medicine and Surgery, . . . or any Name, Title, Addition, or Description implying that he is registered under this Act, or that he is recognised by Law as a Physician, or Surgeon, . . . shall, upon a summary Conviction for any such offence, pay a sum not exceeding Twenty Pounds."

It is, then, sufficiently plain that any doctor practising in this country without the required registration, would not only place himself in the position of a quack and a charlatan, but would actually incur legal penalties

for assuming medical titles, however fairly they may have been won in the most eminent of foreign Universities. It is therefore clear that it became a *sine quâ non* that any women, desiring to practise medicine in this country, should obtain their education in such a way as would entitle them to demand registration.

Though several English ladies are recorded in history as having studied medical science, I am not aware that any of our country-women ever graduated in medicine before the year 1849, when Miss Elizabeth Blackwell, after surmounting many difficulties, obtained the degree of M.D. from a college in the State of New York. Returning subsequently to England, she took advantage of the clause in the Act of 1858, which I have already mentioned, and demanded and obtained registration in the British Register. But the clause referred to was, as I have explained, retrospective only, and no one could subsequently obtain an American degree and in virtue of it claim registration in this country.

This being the case, when, in the year 1860, Miss Garrett resolved to begin the study of medicine, with a view to practising in England, it was necessary that she should obtain her education under the auspices of some one of the medical corporations empowered to give registrable qualifications. After trying in vain to obtain admission to one School and College after another, she finally found entrance at Apothecaries' Hall, which was, from its charter, taken as I suppose, in conjunction

with the provisions of the Apothecaries' Act of 1815,[1] incapable of refusing to examine any candidate who complied with its conditions of study.

In order to observe the regulations of Apothecaries' Hall, she was obliged to attend the lectures of certain specified teachers; and though she was in some cases admitted to the ordinary classes,[2] in others she was compelled to pay very heavy fees for separate and private tuition by the recognized lecturers. She had also considerable difficulty in obtaining adequate hospital teaching, though there was, in truth, hardly the slightest difference between the advantages she needed and those now habitually accorded to lady probationers and trained nurses, who are constantly present with the ordinary students at the bedside and in the operating theatre.[3] She obtained admission, however, to the Middlesex Hospital, and might, I suppose, have studied there as long as she pleased, had she not been unfortunate enough to acquit herself too well in some of the *vivâ-voce* examinations in which she took part with the male students, thus arousing their manly wrath, which

[1] By this Act a Court of Examiners was appointed, and declared to be "authorized *and required* to examine all person or persons applying to them, for the purpose of ascertaining the skill or abilities of such person or persons in the science of medicine, and his or their fitness and qualification to practise as Apothecaries;"—it being, however, stipulated that all candidates so applying should have gone through certain preliminary studies and apprenticeship, and should pay certain fees.

[2] The classes attended by Miss Garrett, in common with the other students, were as follows:—Chemistry, Practical Chemistry, Materia Medica, Botany, Zoology, and Natural Philosophy.

[3] See *Note H.*

showed itself in a request that she should be required to leave the Hospital,[1] and this noble and magnanimous application was actually granted! She, however, completed her studies elsewhere, and especially at the London Hospital; being, it is to be presumed, too discreet to enter again on the field of competition. Thus, at length, she obtained her education, and, in 1865, received the licence to practise from Apothecaries' Hall, which enabled her to place her name upon the British Register. But no sooner had she thus demonstrated the existence of at least a postern gate by which women might enter the profession, than the authorities took alarm, and, with the express object of preventing other women from following so terrible a precedent, a rule was passed, forbidding students henceforth to receive any part of their education privately, it being well known that women would be rigorously excluded from some at least of the public classes! This noble course was actually recommended and approved by one of the leading medical journals, as a safe way of evading the obligations of the charter, and yet effectually shutting out the one chance left to the women![2]

As, then, the different doors by which the two ladies above mentioned entered the profession of medicine were both closed after them, it is evident that when, in 1869, I looked round for the means of obtaining

[1] "A woman must have uncommon sweetness of disposition and manners to be *forgiven* for possessing superior talents and acquirements." —Miss Elizabeth Smith (*Memoir, by H. M. Bowdler*).

[2] See *Note I.*

medical education in this country, it was necessary that some new way should be devised. It is true that in several of the European Universities women were at that moment studying medicine;—indeed, I am not aware that any of the Italian,[1] French, or Swiss Universities have ever been closed against women who applied for admission. I might, no doubt, have obtained, at the world-renowned *Ecole de Médecine* in Paris, a medical education at least equal, and, in some respects, probably superior, to anything that this country affords; and at the Universities of Zurich and Bern, also, a considerable number of women have, for some years, been receiving an excellent medical education. But it seemed to me radically unjust, and most discreditable to Great Britain, that all her daughters who desired a University education should be driven abroad to seek it; only a small number of women could be expected thus to expatriate themselves, and those who did so would have to incur the great additional difficulty and disadvantage of studying all the departments of medical science in a foreign language, and under teachers whose experience had been acquired in a different climate and under different social conditions from our own. And, even if these difficulties could be overcome, another objection appeared to me absolutely insuperable. The Act of 1858 distinctly

[1] In the year 1870 the question was formally asked of the Italian Government whether women were legally entitled to study in the Universities, and the answer was in the affirmative.

declares that only British licences, diplomas, and degrees can now claim registration, and that without registration no practitioner can be considered as legally qualified. It is well known with what distinguished honour Miss Garrett passed her examinations in Paris in 1870, and with what brilliant success she gained one of the most valuable medical degrees in Europe; and yet in the official British Register her name appears only and solely as that of a licentiate of Apothecaries' Hall. As no such licence was now open to me and to other women, it was clear that those of us who went abroad for education might expect, after years of severe labour, to return to England to be refused official recognition on the Register, and, in fact, in the eye of the law, to hold a position exactly analogous to that of the most ignorant quack or herbalist who might open a penny stall for the sale of worthless nostrums. As such a position was hardly to my taste, it became necessary to try other means.

It seemed to me highly desirable that, if women studied medicine at all, they should at once aim at what is supposed to be a high standard of education, and that, to avoid the possibility of cavil at their attainments, they should forthwith aspire to the medical degree of a British University.

I first applied to the University of London, of whose liberality one heard so much, and was told by the Registrar that the existing Charter had been purposely so worded as to exclude the possibility of examining

women for medical degrees, and that under that Charter nothing whatever could be done in their favour. Knowing that at Oxford and Cambridge the whole question was complicated with regulations respecting residence, while, indeed, neither of these Universities furnished a complete medical education, my thoughts naturally turned to Scotland, to which so much credit is always given for its enlightened views respecting education, and where the Universities boast of their freedom from ecclesiastical and other trammels. In March 1869, therefore, I made my first application to the University of Edinburgh, and I hope in the following pages to give a rapid sketch of the chief events of the subsequent five years in connection with that University, though time and space oblige me to make the sketch so brief that I must ask the reader's indulgence if, in some points, it is less plain and distinct than it might be if I could enter more fully into details.

For the sake of clearness, let me first explain, in few words, who constitute the different bodies that take a share in the government of Edinburgh University, taken in the order in which my application was considered by them. The *Medical Faculty* of course consists of Medical Professors only; the *Senatus* comprises all the Professors of every Faculty, and also the Principal; the *University Court* is composed of the Rector, the Principal, and the Lord Provost of Edinburgh; with five others appointed respectively by the

Chancellor, the Rector, the Senatus, the Town Council of Edinburgh, and the General Council of the University; and, lastly, the *General Council* of the University consists of all those graduates of Edinburgh who have registered their names as members. Each of these bodies had to be consulted, as also the *Chancellor*, before any important change could be made.

When I first went to Edinburgh, I found many most kind and liberal friends among the Professors. In the Medical Faculty itself, Sir James Simpson, Professor Hughes Bennett, and Professor Balfour, Dean of the Medical Faculty, at once espoused my cause; and I need hardly say that Professors Masson, Charteris, Calderwood, Lorimer, Wilson, Blackie, and some other members of the non-medical Faculties, were not a whit behind in kindness and help. I found, on the other hand, a few determined enemies, who would listen to nothing I could urge on the ground of either justice or mercy, and one or two who seemed to think that the fact of a woman's wishing to study medicine at all quite exempted them from the necessity of treating her even with ordinary courtesy. One medical Professor, Dr. Laycock, calmly told me, when I called on him, that he "could not imagine *any decent woman* wishing to study medicine,—as for *any lady*, *that* was out of the question." The majority, however, occupied a somewhat neutral position;—they did not wish arbitrarily to stretch their power to exclude

women from education, and yet they were alarmed at what seemed to them the magnitude and novelty of the change proposed.

Several Professors were especially timid about the question of matriculation, and argued that, till they had some evidence of probable success, it would be premature to let women matriculate, since by so doing they would acquire rights and privileges of the most extensive kind.[1] To meet this difficulty, I gladly accepted a suggestion made to me privately by the Dean of the Medical Faculty, that I should, for the present, waive the question of matriculation, and should, during the summer months, attend his class in Botany and that of Professor Allman in Natural History, to see whether, as the *Spectator* expressed it, "Scotch and English students were really so much more brutal than Frenchmen and Germans," or whether a woman could, without discomfort, attend the ordinary classes. This plan met with much approval, and some of the Professors' wives most kindly offered to accompany me to the classes when the time should come. The Medical Faculty and Senatus successively sanctioned this tentative plan, and, after a short stay in Edinburgh, I left for England to make preparations for returning to spend the summer session as arranged.

But two or three hostile Professors appealed to the University Court; some of the students also sent up a

[1] Unfortunately the University succeeded only too well, subsequently, in proving that those "rights" were practically *nil*.

memorial against the arrangement proposed, and the question was "reconsidered."

I am anxious, as far as possible, to avoid personalities in this matter, and yet, I think, I cannot properly tell my story without explaining at the outset that, in my opinion at least, the whole opposition to the medical education of women was, in Edinburgh, dictated by one man and his immediate followers. It is hardly necessary to say that that man was Sir Robert Christison,[1] whose great age and long tenure of office naturally gave him unusual weight, both in the University and among the medical men of Edinburgh. Having said this, I need only remark further, that Professor Christison was, from the time I came to Edinburgh, the only Professor and the only medical

[1] On this point I may quote the following passage from the *Scotsman*, whose great influence has always been most nobly exerted in this question on the side of justice and liberality, and to whose help, in arousing the moral sense of the community, we owe a debt that we can never hope to pay. The words quoted occur in a leading article referring to a meeting of the General Council, of which mention will be found elsewhere:—"*Even Dr. Christison, who is well known to be in truth the very soul and centre of the opposition, and whose personal influence alone has probably prevailed to carry it on so long in the teeth of public opinion*, thought it advisable to say at the Council meeting, that 'if anything could be done to get the ladies out of their difficulty, he should be glad to be one to give them assistance.' This expression sounds somewhat farcical to those who are aware that the present dead-lock arises simply from the fact that the ladies' studies have now brought them to that point at which Dr. Christison's class comes next in turn to be attended, and that the Professor, in spite of his verbal gallantry, has flatly refused either to instruct them himself or facilitate arrangements by which any one can do so in his place."—*Scotsman*, October 31, 1871.

man who had a seat in the University Court, and also the only person who had all along been a member of every important body, without exception, by whom our interests have had to be decided, viz. of the Medical Faculty, the Senatus, the University Court, the University Council, and the Infirmary Board.

The question then was brought before the University Court in April 1869. The meetings of the Court are held in strict privacy, (against which the public and the members of the University Council have often protested,) and I can only state the result of their deliberation. On April 19th the following resolution was passed :—"The Court, considering the difficulties at present standing in the way of carrying out the resolution of the Senatus, *as a temporary arrangement in the interest of one lady*, and not being prepared to adjudicate finally on the question whether women should be educated in the medical classes of the University, sustain the appeals, and recall the resolution of the Senatus."

The very palpable invitation to other ladies to come forward, which appeared on the face of this resolution, bore fruit ; for, in the course of the next month or two, four more ladies expressed their wish to be admitted as students, and certain of the University authorities held out hopes that an application for *separate* classes would be successful. Accordingly, in June 1869, I addressed a letter to the Rector of the University, who

is also President of the University Court, enquiring whether the Court would "remove their present veto in case arrangements can be made for the instruction of women in separate classes; and whether, in that case, women will be allowed to matriculate in the usual way, and to undergo the ordinary Examination, with a view to obtain medical degrees in due course?"

I also wrote to the Senatus, asking them to recommend the matriculation of women as medical students, on the understanding that separate classes should be formed; and, moreover, addressed a letter to the Dean of the Medical Faculty, offering, on behalf of my fellow-students and myself, to guarantee whatever minimum fee the Faculty might fix as remuneration for these separate classes.

On July 1st, 1869, at a meeting of the Medical Faculty of the University, it was resolved to recommend to the Senatus:—

"(1.) That ladies be allowed to matriculate as medical students, and to pass the usual preliminary examination for registration; (2.) That ladies be allowed to attend medical classes, and to receive certificates of attendance qualifying for examination, provided the classes are confined entirely to ladies; (3.) That the medical Professors be allowed to have classes for ladies, but no Professor shall be compelled to give such course of lectures; (4.) That, in conformity with the request of Miss Jex-Blake's letter to the Dean, ladies be permitted to arrange with the Medical Faculty, or with the individual Professors, as to minimum fee for the classes."

At a meeting of the Senatus Academicus, July 2nd, 1869, the Report of the Medical Faculty was read, agreed to, and ordered to be transmitted to the University Court.

At a meeting of the University Court, on July 23rd, 1869, "Mr. Gordon, on behalf of the Committee appointed at last meeting to consider what course should be followed in order to give effect to the resolution of the Senatus, reported that the Committee were of opinion that the matter should be proceeded with under section xii. 2, of the Universities Act, as an improvement in the internal arrangements of the University." Mr. Gordon then moved the following resolution, which was adopted :—

"The Court entertain an opinion favourable to the resolutions of the Medical Faculty in regard to the matriculation of ladies as medical students, and direct these resolutions to be laid before the General Council of the University for their consideration at next meeting."

This resolution was approved by the General Council on October 29th, 1869, and was sanctioned by the Chancellor on November 12th, 1869. The following regulations, drawn up by the Court, were officially issued at the same date, and inserted in the Calendar of the University :—

"(1.) Women shall be admitted to the study of medicine in the University; (2.) The instruction of women for the profession of medicine shall be conducted in separate classes, confined entirely to women; (3.) The Professors of the Faculty of Medicine shall, for this purpose, be permitted to have separate classes for women; (4.) Women, not intending to study medicine professionally, may be admitted to such of these classes, or to such part of the course of instruction given in such classes, as the University Court may from time to time think fit and approve; (5.) The fee for the full course of instruction in such classes shall be four guineas; but in the event of the number of students proposing to attend any such class being too small to provide a reasonable remuneration at that rate, it shall be in the power of the Professor to

make arrangements for a higher fee, subject to the usual sanction of the University Court; (6.) All women attending such classes shall be subject to all the regulations now or at any future time in force in the University as to the matriculation of students, their attendance on classes, Examination, or otherwise; (7.) The above regulations shall take effect as from the commencement of session 1869–70." [1]

In accordance with the above resolutions, four other ladies [2] and myself were, in October 1869, admitted provisionally to the usual preliminary examination in Arts, prescribed for medical students entering the University.[3] Having duly passed, and received certificates to that effect from the Dean of the Medical Faculty, we, after the issue of the regulations above cited, all matriculated in the ordinary manner at the office of the Secretary of the University. We paid the usual fee, inscribed our names in the University album,[4] with

[1] As some attempts were subsequently made to throw doubt on the validity of the regulations just quoted, and, in fact, on the legality of the matriculation of women, I think it well to specify distinctly certain of the persons who were most immediately concerned in the University action just described. The University Court which drew up the above regulations, contained among its members Mr. Moncreiff, then Lord Advocate of Scotland, and Mr. Gordon, who had held the same office under a previous Government, besides two other legal members. The Chancellor who gave his express sanction to all the measures taken, was Lord Glencorse, (Inglis,) the Lord Justice-General of Scotland. I leave the public to judge how far it is probable that these gentlemen conjoined to do an illegal and invalid act on behalf of the University.

[2] These were Mrs. Thorne, Miss Pechey, Mrs. Evans, and Miss Chaplin. To these a year later were added Miss Anderson and Miss Bovell, these six constituting, with myself, the so-called "*Septem contra Edinam.*"

[3] See *Note J.*

[4] Thus signing our names, we subscribed a promise of obedience to college discipline, which was written above in Latin.

the usual particulars, including the Faculty in which we proposed to study, and received the ordinary matriculation tickets, which bore our names, and declared us to be "*Cives Academiæ Edinensis.*" We were at the same time registered in due course as students of medicine, by the Registrar of the Branch Council for Scotland, in the Government Register kept by order of the General Council of Medical Education and Registration of the United Kingdom, such registration being obligatory on all medical students, and affording the sole legal record of the date at which they have commenced their studies.

It seemed now as if smooth water had at length been reached, after seven months of almost incessant struggle. The temporary scheme first suggested had been set aside, but its place had been taken by one much more comprehensive, which had resulted from five months of consideration and consultation, and which had ultimately received the sanction of every one of the University authorities in succession. Not only were women allowed the privilege of matriculation, which we had been told involved so much, but formal regulations, entitled "For the Education of Women in Medicine in the University," had been framed, and for several years formed an integral part of the University Calendar.

For six months our hopes seemed realized. We pursued most interesting courses of study in the University, and found nothing but kindness at the

hands of our teachers, and courtesy from the male students, whenever we happened to meet them in the quadrangle or on the staircases. I remember that on one occasion we crossed the quadrangle while some students were snowballing each other, and, simply by accident, a snowball struck one of our number. The howl of indignation and regret that burst from the students showed that their annoyance at the incident was infinitely greater than our own ;—a straw shows which way the wind blows. Even Dr. Christison was reported to have said in Senatus, that, as the experiment was to be tried, he for one would co-operate to give it a fair trial.

Though the lectures were delivered at different hours, the instruction given to us and to the male students was identical, and, when the class examinations took place, we received and answered the same papers at the same hour and on identical conditions, having been told that marks would be awarded indifferently to "both sections of the class,"—this latter expression being, by the bye, repeatedly used during the course of the term by both the Professors who instructed us.

I am obliged now to mention the results which appeared in the prize-lists, not with a view to claim any special credit for the ladies[1] (whose efforts to

[1] I fully agree in the following remarks made by a local paper when the results of the next summer term were declared :—"The whole number of gentlemen who appear in the prize-lists (in Botany) are 32, out of 140

obtain education might well make them more zealous than most of the ordinary students), but because I believe that the facts I am about to mention had a real and immediate connection with subsequent events.[1]

In the class of Physiology there had been 127 male students, of whom 25 appeared in the honours list; in the Chemistry class there were 226 male students, of whom 31 obtained honours; of the 5 women, 4 were in honours in both classes. One of the ladies obtained the third place in the Chemistry prize-list; and, as the two gentlemen above her had already gone through a course of lectures on the same subject, Miss Pechey was actually first of her year. In the College Calendar it was stated that "the four students who have received the highest marks *are entitled* to have the Hope Scholarships,"—such scholarships giving free admission to the College laboratory, and having been founded by the late Professor Hope from the pro-

competitors—*i.e.*, about 23 per cent.; of the ladies, *all*. We believe that these results prove, not that women's capacities are better than those of men,—a thing that few people would assert,—but that these women, who are devoting themselves to obtain, in spite of all difficulties, a thorough knowledge of their profession, are far more thoroughly in earnest than most of the men are, and that their ultimate success is certain in proportion. Nor would we omit the inference that, this being so, those who wantonly throw obstacles in the way of this gallant little band, incur a proportionately heavy responsibility, as wanting not only in the spirit of chivalry, but even in the love of fair play, which we should be sorry to think wanting in any Briton."

—*Daily Review*, August 5, 1870.

[1] Compare Miss Garrett's experience, p. 67.

ceeds of lectures *given to ladies* some fifty years previously.[1]

It had occurred to us that if any lady won this scholarship she might be debarred from making full use of it as regards the laboratory, in consequence of the prohibition against mixed classes; but as it had been distinctly ordained that we were to be subject to "all the regulations in force in the University as to examinations," it had *not* occurred to us as possible that the very name of Hope Scholar could be wrested from the successful candidate and given over her head to the fifth student on the list, who had the good fortune to be a man.[2]

But this was actually done.

At the same time that the Professor announced to us his intention of withholding the Hope Scholarship from the student who had won it, on the ground that, having studied at a different hour, she was not a member of *The Chemistry Class*, though he, at the same time, gave her a bronze medal of the University, (to which I should think her claim must have been neither greater nor less, since these medals were given to the five students highest on the list,) he offered us written certificates of having attended "*a ladies' class* in the University," as of course he saw that to give the

[1] I am told that on this occasion the obstructives of the day actually shut the College gates on the ladies, but that the gallant old Professor, nothing daunted, admitted them through a ground-floor window in South College Street!

[2] See *Note K.*

ordinary certificates of attendance on "*The* Chemistry Class of the University" would be to destroy his own argument with reference to the scholarship. As, however, such certificates were absolutely worthless to us as students of medicine, we declined them, and appealed to the Senatus to ordain that the ordinary certificates should be granted to us, as they alone would qualify for professional examination. At the same time Miss Pechey made an appeal to have the Hope Scholarship awarded to her in due course. It is hardly credible that (by I think a majority of one in each case) the Senatus decided that we were to have exactly the ordinary certificates, which declared us to have attended *The Chemistry Class* of the University of Edinburgh, and yet acquiesced in Miss Pechey's being deprived of her scholarship, on the ground that she was not a member of that class![1]

I do not wish to dwell longer on these incidents, but I have narrated them here because I believe that the above-mentioned results of the class examinations aroused in our opponents a conviction that the so-called experiment was not going to fail of itself, as they had confidently hoped, but that if it was to be suppressed at all, vigorous measures must be taken for that purpose.

At the previous meeting of the University Council, no Professor had stood up to oppose the admission of women, though Dr. Andrew Wood had covered himself

[1] See *Note L.*

with glory by protesting that he had too many sons to provide for, to acquiesce in the education of women for the medical profession![1] At the next meeting, however, of the Council, in April 1870, Professor Masson moved that, in view of the success that had hitherto attended the ladies' studies, the existing regulations should be so far relaxed as to allow of the attendance of women in the ordinary classes, where no special reasons existed to the contrary, that they might be spared the additional expense, inconvenience, and difficulty attendant on the formation of separate classes in every subject. Professor Balfour, Dean of the Medical Faculty, seconded this motion, and expressed his opinion that arrangements might easily be made to carry it out. Professors Laycock and Christison, how-

[1] The following passage occurs in a leading article on the riot got up in Philadelphia by male medical students, when in 1869 ladies were first admitted to the Pennsylvania Hospital:—"Their riotous procedure is just a manifestion of the same trades-union spirit that will stoop to any meanness, join in any tyranny, be guilty of any cruelty, rather than allow interference with what is considered as its 'vested rights.' In last week's *Lancet* we find a letter from a medical man, who asks with naïve surprise whether the advocates of female physicians can possibly be aware that there are hundreds of medical *men* not able to make a comfortable living We know not which most to admire—the cool assumption that the medical profession exists only or mainly to fill the pockets of its members, or the serene assurance that takes it for granted that no woman has a right to expect to be allowed the chance of earning a living, till all male competitors are safely and sufficiently provided for! It is rather amusing to contrast the evidently keen dread of successful competition, which degrades a man thus to plead *in formâ pauperis*, with the voluble assurances, in this and other medical papers, that nature has clearly interdicted to women the practice of medicine, and that here at least they cannot but utterly fail."—*Scotsman*, Dec. 4, 1869.

ever, opposed it vigorously, and that in speeches of such a character that the *Times*[1] remarked in a leading article:—"We cannot sufficiently express the indignation with which we read such language, and we must say that it is the strongest argument against the admission of young ladies to the Edinburgh medical classes, that they would attend the lectures of Professors capable of talking in this strain."[2] When the vote was taken, the motion in our favour was lost by 47 votes to 58, and no change was therefore made in the University regulations.

The Professor of Botany kindly made arrangements for giving to us and other ladies a separate course of lectures, though he much regretted to be forced to this double, and needless, expenditure of time and trouble. Dr. Allman, the Professor of Natural History, who had in the previous summer consented to my entering his ordinary class, stated that his health would not allow him to undertake the labour of two classes, and, therefore, he could not teach us. We then made application for instruction to Dr. Alleyne Nicholson, the extra-mural teacher of the same subject, and he at once agreed to our request. Before making any arrangements, he spoke to the members of his class at their first meeting, and, mentioning our application, he enquired whether they would unite with him in inviting us to join their class. This they unanimously did; and, as we had no

[1] *Times*, April 25, 1870.
[2] See *Note M.*

objection to offer, the first "mixed class" was inaugurated, and continued throughout the summer without the slightest inconvenience.[1]

In the meantime, we were anxious to make arrangements for the next winter session, and it was especially necessary that a course of instruction in Anatomy should be provided, as the subject was one of the greatest importance, and the University Professor, Mr. Turner, flatly refused either to instruct us himself or allow his assistant to do so in any way whatever. Under these circumstances we endeavoured to obtain a competent extra-mural teacher, who should form a special class for our instruction; but I was repeatedly warned that by this time the medical prejudice had been so strongly aroused against us, and the medical influence was so strongly at work, that we should fail

[1] "In answer to an incorrect statement which appeared in one of the medical papers respecting his class, Dr. Alleyne Nicholson has forwarded to its editor a letter, from which we extract the following passage:—. . . 'The course of lectures on Zoology, which I am now delivering to a mixed class, is identically the same as the course which I delivered last winter to my ordinary class of male students. I have not hitherto emasculated my lectures in any way whatsoever, nor have I the smallest intention of so doing. In so acting, I am guided by the firm conviction that little stress is to be laid on the purity and modesty of those who find themselves able to extract food for improper feelings from such a purely scientific subject as Zoology, however freely handled. "To the pure all things are pure."' In the moral courage and manly purity of the above letter we find fresh cause to congratulate the ladies on the teacher they have secured, on a subject which might easily have been made offensive by a man of a prurient mind. As teachers of truly scientific spirit become more common, we shall, doubtless, hear less and less of the difficulties of giving instruction to classes composed of medical students of both sexes."—*Daily Review*, June 14, 1870.

in our endeavours, as hardly any young medical man dare run the risk of being ostracised for giving us help; and so indeed it proved. The only extra-mural teacher of Anatomy who was already recognised by the University was Dr. Handyside, who was one of a band of nine associated lecturers, who conjointly rented a building, called Surgeons' Hall, for their lectures. Some of these lecturers were indignant at the way in which we were treated in the University, and, in July 1870 they, by a majority, passed the following resolutions :—

"1. That it is expedient that lecturers in this Medical School should be free to lecture to female as well as to male students.

"2. That no restrictions be imposed on the lecturers as to the manner in which instruction is to be imparted to women."

After the passing of this regulation, we applied to Dr. Handyside to know if he could make arrangements for giving us a separate class. He replied that it would be quite impossible for him to do so consistently with his duty to his other students, but that if we liked to attend his course of Anatomy in the ordinary way, he should be happy to receive us. Dr. Heron Watson similarly declined to give a separate class, but consented to admit us to his ordinary course of Lectures on Surgery; and, as we had no objections to make to these proposals, our arrangements for winter lectures were complete.

The class of Practical Anatomy always meets at the beginning of October, although the lectures do not commence till the following month. The more studious

and industrious students usually come up at the earlier date, but those who care less about their work seldom appear till November, as that is the beginning of the compulsory session. All through October we studied under Dr. Handyside with great comfort; the students who worked with us, in another part of the same room, were never uncivil, and in fact we hardly exchanged a dozen sentences with any of them during the month. Dr. Handyside, and his demonstrator Mr. Hoggan, both told us that they had never seen so much steady, earnest work as since we joined the class, and expressed their opinion that the results were quite as valuable for the male students as for ourselves. With November 1st the lectures began, and everything went on satisfactorily for another ten days.

In the University itself the question was raised on October 28th, 1870, when a motion was brought forward in the General Council in favour of affording further facilities to the lady students. The motion was met with a direct negative, and in the course of debate Professor Christison distinguished himself by asserting that he "could positively contradict the statement that the movement was patronized by the highest lady in the realm. A communication was made to him—not a formal message, but still a message, sent to him and to Dr. Laycock—to this effect, that Her Majesty concurred in the views that had been expressed on that occasion by Drs. Laycock and Christison; that she desired that this communication should be intimated to

them, and that her sentiments should be made known." [1] When put to the vote the negative was carried by 47 votes to 46, and the matter was again shelved as regarded the University.[2]

About this time, acting on the advice of a medical friend, we made an application for permission to study in the wards of the Royal Infirmary, and, somewhat to our surprise, were met by a curt refusal. As we knew that several of the Managers were liberal minded and just men, we felt sure that they could not have fully understood the importance to us of the concession we desired, and, on enquiry, I found this was the case. One of those who had voted against our admission confessed to me that he had, in so doing, been guided simply by the medical members of the Board, and that he was not even aware that we were matriculated students of the University, and that we could not complete our education without attending the Infirmary, as there was no other hospital in Edinburgh of the size prescribed for "qualifying instruction." We, therefore, drew up a memorial stating our grounds of application,

[1] Whether or not this statement was correct respecting the Queen, I have never had the means of ascertaining; if so, her opinion was probably based on incomplete information, and has since been changed, for when the Duke of Connaught, in November 1883, laid the foundation of the Cama Hospital at Bombay, to be officered wholly by medical women, he expressly remarked that "Her Majesty the Empress would most highly approve of the excellent object of the hospital." Some of the expressions of public opinion elicited at the time by Dr. Christison's very ill-advised statement are given in *Note N.*

[2] *Scotsman*, October 29, 1870.

and another was also sent in by our two teachers, Dr. Watson and Dr. Handyside, urging on the Board the great injustice that would be done by our exclusion. We also obtained and sent in a written paper from three of the medical officers of the Infirmary, promising to give us all needful instruction, if we were admitted.[1] When these documents were presented to the Managers, a majority of those present were in favour of our immediate admission, but, on the ground of want of notice, our opponents got the matter deferred for a week. From that time the behaviour of the students changed. It is not for me to say what means were used, or what strings were pulled, but I know that the result was, that instead of being, as heretofore, silent and inoffensive, a certain proportion of the students with whom we worked became markedly offensive and insolent, and took every opportunity of practising the petty annoyances that occur to thoroughly ill-bred lads, —such as shutting doors in our faces, ostentatiously crowding into the seats we usually occupied, bursting into horse-laughs and howls when we approached,—as if a conspiracy had been formed to make our position as uncomfortable as might be. At the same time, a students' petition against our admission to the Infirmary was handed about, and 500 signatures were obtained, though, if some of the reports I heard were true, but a very small number out of the 500 had even read the petition before signing it. Be this as it may, the

[1] See *Note O.*

petition was got ready for the adjourned meeting, and when that came, every opponent we had among the Managers was at his place, while some of our friends were unavoidably absent, and the Lord Provost, being in the chair, was precluded from voting, so that the medical party gained an easy victory. But when I say the medical party, I ought to explain that three medical men voted on our side,—a point on which I shall have to say something subsequently.

The students were naturally elated at finding so much attention paid to their petition,[1] especially as I was told that some of the medical Professors had warmly applauded them for their exertions, and I suppose the lowest section among them began to wonder whether, if they had succeeded in keeping us out of the Infirmary, they might not, by a little extra brutality, drive us away from the lecture-room. I was told, indeed, at the time, that a medical Professor had said to some of his students, that "it was really much to their credit that the students had not pelted the ladies away from the classes." "Now we shall *be* pelted," said I, and so it proved.[2] A day or two later came the second competitive examination of the term in the Anatomy class, and

[1] See *Note P.*

[2] Shortly afterwards, Sir James Coxe, M.D., remarked significantly enough, "A good deal of capital has been made out of the objections of the male students, but young men will sometimes act on the views which they think will find favour with their teachers, without having given much consideration to the matter themselves; and they may even go the length of acting on the principle of throwing into the pond the persons they were cautioned not to duck" (laughter).—*Edinburgh Courant*, Jan. 17, 1871.

then occurred the "riot" which it may be as well briefly to describe. Various small circumstances had led us to anticipate something unpleasant; and on the afternoon of Friday, November 18th, 1870, we women walked down together to Surgeons' Hall. As soon as we came in sight of the gates, we found a dense mob filling up the roadway in front of them, comprising some dozen of the lowest class of our fellow-students at Surgeons' Hall, with many more of the same class from the University, a certain number of street rowdies, and some hundreds of gaping spectators, who took no particular part in the matter. Not a single policeman was visible, though the crowd was sufficient to stop all traffic for about an hour.[1] We walked straight up to the gates, which remained open until we came within a yard of them, when they were slammed in our faces by a number of young men, who stood within, smoking and passing about bottles of whisky, while they abused us in the foulest possible language, which I am thankful to say I have never heard equalled before or since. We waited quietly on the step to see if the rowdies were

[1] "If there had been even *one* policeman, I would gladly have given into custody two male students who were evidently the ringleaders, one especially, whose language would have disgraced the lowest inhabitant of the Cowgate. Is a mob of young men to be allowed to congregate for about two hours in one of our large thoroughfares, for the express purpose of insulting a few ladies, because our police arrangements are so unutterably bad that they can count on perfect immunity in so doing for at least one hour? The mob began to collect long before four o'clock, and no action was taken by the police until after five. . . . An Eye-witness."

—*Daily Review*, November 21, 1870.

to have it all their own way, and in a minute we saw another fellow-student of ours, Mr. Sanderson, rush down from Surgeons' Hall, and wrench open the gate, in spite of the howls and efforts of our half-tipsy opponents. We were quick to seize the chance offered, and in a very few seconds we had all passed through the gate, and entered the Anatomical class-room, where the usual examination was conducted in spite of the yells and howls resounding outside, and the forcible intrusion of a luckless sheep, that was pushed in by the rioters. "Let it remain," said Dr. Handyside; "it has more sense than those who sent it here." At the close of the class the lecturer offered to let us out by a back door, but I glanced round the ranks of our fellow-students, and remarked that I thought there were "enough gentlemen here to prevent any harm to us." I had judged rightly. In a moment a couple of dozen students came down from the benches, headed by Mr. Sanderson, Mr. Hoggan, Mr. Macleod, and Mr. Lyon, formed themselves into a regular body-guard in front, behind, and on each side, and, encompassed by them, we passed through the still howling crowd at the gate, and reached home with no other injuries than those inflicted on our dresses by the mud hurled at us by our chivalrous foes. Nor was this all. When we arrived at the College next day, at the same hour, we found quite a formidable array of gentlemen, with big sticks in their hands, who were keeping back a rabble that looked greatly disgusted, but merely vented their spite

in remarkably bad language as the gentlemen referred to raised their hats as we approached, and instantly followed us in and took their seats on the back rows. After the lecture was over, they formed round us, as on the evening before, escorted us home, gave us three deafening cheers, and dispersed. The explanation of all which was, that, hearing rumours of renewed rioting, a certain number of manly men among the students had resolved that the thing should not be, and for the next two or three days this same stalwart body-guard awaited and attended us daily, till the rowdies tacitly agreed to lay aside hostilities. Then I myself asked our volunteer guard to discontinue their most chivalrous escort, and quiet was restored.

Now I wish it to be distinctly understood that I should not have thought it worth while to say so much about this incident, had I believed it to be a spontaneous ebullition of ill-temper on the part of our fellow-students, but I am quite sure that it was not so. It was part of a plan deliberately made in the University, after the remark of the medical Professor already mentioned, and the first act in the performance was the circulation of a missive among *University* students (with whom during that session we had no concern at all), summoning all opponents of the ladies to meet at the gates of Surgeons' Hall at the time named.[1] I had occasion to state publicly a few months later, that the leader of the rioters inside the gate was Dr. Christison's class-

[1] See *Note Q.*

assistant, and added that "the foul language he used could only be excused on the supposition that he was intoxicated. I do not say that Dr. Christison knew of or sanctioned his presence, but I do say that I think he would not have been there had he thought the Doctor would have strongly objected to his presence."[1] Of this I shall have more to say subsequently.

It is worth mention that a few days later I had notice given to me that a still "more serious demonstration" was intended. I spoke to our kind friend Professor Wilson, Secretary of Senatus, about the matter, and he accordingly asked Professor Turner to keep his class (Anatomy Demonstration) in till a few minutes past five, that we might have time to go home. The class was dismissed *at* **4. 45 !** Luckily it was a wet night, and no crowd assembled, and in any case we then had still the escort of the friendly students, commonly called "the Irish Brigade," from the number of chivalrous Irishmen in it. One of them earnestly adjured us to go to "Ould Oireland," where he said such scenes would be impossible; and I remembered his words when in 1876 the Irish College of Physicians was the first of all the Examining Boards to admit women.

As if a general signal had been given for an attack from all the powers of evil, the next few weeks were distinguished by the publication of a number of indecent articles in various papers that took up the

[1] See *Scotsman*, January 3, 1871.

cause of our opponents. The worst of them are really too filthy to quote, but any one interested in such gems of literature can refer to the *Medical Times and Gazette* of November 19th and 26th, and of December 3rd and 10th, 1870, and to the *Saturday Review* of November 26th, 1870.[1]

It is truly fortunate that those who are capable of writing brutalities of this sort are generally quite incapable of estimating the effect of them upon the more decent section of society. Some of the worst paragraphs from the *Medical Times and Gazette* were reprinted in a circular, and sent round to contributors to the Royal Infirmary, in the hope of prejudicing our cause. So far as I know the effect was exactly the opposite, for it roused some of the general public for the first time to consider what must be the character and what the motives of those capable of circulating such

[1] "The bitter, and, so far as we know, the unprecedented malignity with which women who aspire to be doctors are pursued by the literary class, is as hard to explain as it is to tolerate. . . . We can understand why doctors should be angry, for after all every profession in this country is more or less of a trades-union. . . . Nor do we feel altogether at sea as to the motives which prompt students in Philadelphia and Edinburgh to make riotous demonstrations against female associates. Hobbledehoys are always impatient of female society and influence, and of course, having no other means of constitutional opposition at command, manifest their distrust by riotous demonstrations. 'I can't talk French, but I can punch your head.' All this is natural, but . . . it does not account, for instance, for such an article as one that appeared in the *Saturday Review* of last week,—an article, we venture to say, without a literary parallel in the literary history of the last twenty years,—an article which, whatever its motive, is in form a *brutality of which a costermonger quarrelling with a fishwife would be ashamed.*"—*Spectator*, December 3, 1870.

nastiness, and in this way I believe did us a great deal of good.[1]

No further event of importance occurred during the winter, except the meetings of Infirmary contributors, at the first of which a close contest took place between Managers known to be favourable to us and those known to be unfriendly. A new Act came into operation at this date, and all the Managers had to vacate their seats unless re-elected. I can give no more significant proof of the immense amount of pressure brought to bear by the medical clique, than by stating that, of the three medical men who had voted for us six weeks before, it was found when the day of election came that two had turned their coats, while the one, Dr. John Moir, who refused to do so, was unseated by the medical body that he had represented!

At the Contributors' Meeting on Jan. 2nd, 1871, at which six Managers were to be elected, the Lord Provost himself proposed the election of six gentlemen known to be friendly to the admission of ladies to the Infirmary, but by the very narrow majority of 94 votes to 88, the Managers previously on the Board

[1] A number of letters appeared in the papers protesting vehemently against "this vile circular," and one gentleman (a total stranger to us) wrote,—"I have scarcely ever met anything so bad, so gratuitously nasty. I have been no supporter of the female doctor movement, chiefly because I doubt of its ever coming to much; but if you can tell me that as a subscriber to the Royal Infirmary, or in any other capacity, I can do anything to neutralize an opposition conducted on the principles of the so-called "M.D. Edin. Univ., L.R.S.C.E.," I will take some trouble to do so."—*Scotsman*, December 23, 1870.

were returned. No other question was raised, and those who voted with the Lord Provost did so simply in consequence of the importance they attached to the exclusion of the ladies by those Managers who now desired re-election.[1]

At a subsequent meeting (Jan. 16th), the Rev. Professor Charteris brought forward a motion expressive of the desire of the contributors that immediate arrangements should be made for the admission of the ladies, and this motion was seconded by Sir James Coxe, M.D., but was lost by a similarly small majority. On this latter occasion, some incidents occurred that deserve notice, as illustrating the spirit actuating our supporters and opponents respectively. First, a petition in favour of the ladies' admission was presented, signed by 956 women of Edinburgh :—

"Ladies and Gentlemen,—We, the undersigned Women of Edinburgh, not being able to attend the Meeting at which the admission of Female Medical Students to the Infirmary will be discussed, desire hereby to express our great interest in the issues involved, and our earnest hope that full facilities for Hospital study will be afforded by the Managers to all women who desire to enter the Medical Profession."

Secondly, Mrs. Nichol, an elderly lady whose name is venerated throughout Edinburgh, made, in spite of ill-health, the great exertion of coming forward at that public meeting, to ask one question, —"not," as she distinctly said, "in the interests of

[1] It is worth remark that, for the first time within memory, lady contributors used their right of voting on this occasion, and it is tolerably significant that sixteen voted on our behalf, and not one against us. The number of doctors who voted for us was five ; against us, twenty-five.

the lady students, but on behalf of those women who looked forward to see what kind of men were they who were to be the sole medical attendants of the next generation of women, if women doctors are not allowed." The question which she said she had been commissioned to ask by more than 1300 women, belonging to all classes and all parts of the country, was as follows:—

"If the students studying at present in the Infirmary cannot contemplate with equanimity the presence of ladies as fellow-students, how is it possible that they can possess either the scientific spirit, or the personal purity of mind, which alone would justify their presence in the female wards during the most delicate operations on, and examinations of, female patients?"

This question was received, according to the newspaper report, with "*Laughter, hisses, and applause,*" but no one opened his mouth to reply. Perhaps in truth no reply could have been more significant than the burst of yells and howls which greeted the question from a gallery filled by students, who pelted me with peas when I stood up to speak, and indeed so conducted themselves generally as to elicit a remark to me from Professor Blackie, famous for his quaint sayings: "Well! ye can say now ye've fought with beasts at Ephesus!"

At this meeting, also, Professor Muirhead appealed to the contributors to keep the ladies out of the wards, because "of the objections that might be raised by male patients," and also because they were bound to "consider the interests of the male students, whose

feelings of delicacy,—because they had feelings of delicacy (laughter),—were violated by the idea of the presence of women." The pathos of this last appeal was rather spoiled by the roar of laughter that burst from the gallery filled with students, as the words were spoken; and Sir James Coxe, himself a medical man, asked with inconvenient clear-sightedness, "But are the nurses in the wards not females, and are they not present during the medical visits, without proving a restraint either on freedom of speech or freedom of action?" Professor Charteris also remarked that if young men could be present at the most delicate examinations of female patients, and at every kind of operation undergone by them, he was unable to see the conclusiveness of the arguments used by Professor Muirhead; and added, "I can understand how coarse people may speak of any subject under heaven so as to make sensitive people wince, or modest people blush; but if there are any circumstances in which all who speak are likely to speak tenderly, however truly, and when all feelings save those of tenderness and compassion are likely to be banished from the minds of those who hear or see, it is by the bed of sickness and pain. . . . My own experience as a minister leads me to believe that among the women of the very rank from which come most of the female patients in infirmaries, there is a shrinking from uttering their ailments to a man doctor, and a craving for competent female counsel;" and on this ground he in his turn appealed to the con-

tributors not to allow women to be totally excluded from medical education.[1]

About the same time, a petition, signed by twenty-three male students,[2] was presented to the Infirmary Managers, praying that the lady students should no longer be excluded, but no attention was paid to the request; and when subsequently a similar application was made to the Managers by a deputation of very influential citizens,[3] they again refused, by a majority, to do anything in our behalf. Professor Balfour moved the appointment of a Committee to enquire into a scheme for the instruction of ladies proposed by certain of the medical officers of the Infirmary, but Professor Christison carried an amendment negativing even this measure; and thus another year of Hospital instruction was lost.

In judging of this matter, it must be remembered that we asked for no unusual privileges, but merely for

[1] "Motto for Medical Purists.—Sir, allow me to suggest to the medical men who so disinterestedly oppose the entrance of ladies into their profession on grounds of delicacy, that, adopting the chaste goddess as their patron, they should at next Infirmary Meeting confess frankly that '*this our craft is in danger*,' and, 'full of wrath cry out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians!'—I am, etc., J."

—*Scotsman*, Jan. 3, 1871.

[2] See *Note R.*

[3] Several of the principal citizens, including Mr. M'Laren, the senior Member for Edinburgh, had spoken strongly on our behalf at the meetings just mentioned; indeed, it has been remarkable throughout how strongly the municipal element has been on our side, while the leaders of the opposition have, with hardly an exception, been medical men, and their immediate friends and followers.

the opportunities of clinical study which were given as a matter of course to all other matriculated students ; and that we were perfectly willing to leave all details to the Managers, and to study either in mixed or separate classes, as they might think most expedient. We expressly offered to "confine our attendance to those wards in which our attendance is welcomed by the presiding physician or surgeon," and pointed out that "the Infirmary is so large that the portion to which alone we ask admittance is something less than a quarter of the whole ; and even if no restriction is laid on the attendance of the male students, it will be only by their own choice if they attend in the same wards with us, while more than three-fourths of the Hospital will be devoted *exclusively* to their instruction."[1]

If such concessions were refused, it was quite clear that nothing we could ask would be granted. But out of evil may come good. The immediate and most gratifying result of the treatment we had met with at the hands of the Infirmary Managers, was the formation of a very large and influential Committee, which originated at a meeting, called on January 26th, 1871, by the Lord Provost of Edinburgh and other friends. Public sympathy had been strongly aroused by the refusal of the Hope Scholarship to Miss Pechey a few months previously, and the action now taken by the medical obstructives crystallized that sympathy

[1] See *Scotsman*, January 13, 1871.

into definite form. In the course of a very few days, an extremely strong Committee sprang into existence, numbering among its members more than a dozen of the University Professors, and also such honoured names as those of Dean Ramsay, Dr. Guthrie, Mrs. Mary Lundie Duncan, Sir Robert Anstruther, M.P., Sir David Wedderburn, M.P., Sir James Coxe, M.D., Mr. Thomas Constable, and many others. In less than three weeks there were considerably over three hundred members, and the numbers continued to increase subsequently. To the Committee thus inaugurated, we owe a debt which I hardly know how to express adequately. From that time forward to the close of our battle in Edinburgh, they stood by us with a fidelity and a chivalrous readiness to help, which was never marred by officiousness or needless interference. In a very short time, they lifted from our shoulders the whole burden of pecuniary risk and responsibility, and, by personal and public help of every kind, made it possible for us to continue the struggle in which, without such aid, we should have been so hopelessly outnumbered. Where so many gave us such invaluable assistance, it is almost invidious to single out any for special thanks; and yet I cannot refrain from putting on record our extreme debt of gratitude to three men, of whom two have already passed away from among us, viz. the Lord Provost of Edinburgh (William Law), who gave us continually the support of his official countenance

and assistance; Mr. Alexander Russel, Editor of the *Scotsman*, whose advocacy was literally beyond all price in those days, when our one hope and our great difficulty was to get the real truth laid fully and fearlessly before the public;[1] and our still invaluable friend, Professor Masson, whose championship of the weak and oppressed was then, and always has been, worthy of the noblest days of chivalry.

Miss Louisa Stevenson most kindly took upon herself the Hon. Secretaryship of the Committee, and subsequently also managed the very large amount of work connected with petitions to the University and to Parliament, etc., which our friend Mrs. Henry Kingsley, on leaving Edinburgh, was forced to relinquish.

Very shortly after the formation of the Committee, its representatives memorialized the Infirmary Managers to devise measures for the admission of women; but though the request received nominal consideration, its refusal was a foregone conclusion.[2]

It was absolutely needful for us to obtain Hospital instruction, and the only opportunity yet obtained had been granted through the kindness of Dr. Niven, Senior Medical Officer of St. Cuthbert's Poorhouse, who had taken us with him once a week to his Infirmary during our first winter session. But the

[1] "The *Scotsman*, then edited by the brightest and ablest of all editors of his time, Alexander Russel, and more truly representing the best thought of Scotland and its capital than any or all of the other papers."
—*Memoirs of Adam Black.*

[2] See *Scotsman*, April 20, 1871.

distance of the Infirmary from town, and the class of cases received there, made it impossible that this could be a permanent or satisfactory arrangement. We applied to the Hospital for Sick Children, to Chalmers' Hospital, and even to the Leith Hospital, for admission on any terms the Managers chose to appoint, but everywhere our application was refused.[1]

The first public meeting of the "Committee for securing a Medical Education to Women in Edinburgh," was held on April 19th, 1871.[2] At it was read a letter from the Rev. Dr. Guthrie, beginning, "I am heartily with you in the cause." It was announced that the members of Committee living in and near Edinburgh numbered 375, and that it also included already 160 members residing at a distance, and comprising the following names:—the Bishop of Exeter (Temple); Rt. Hon. Russell Gurney, Recorder of London; Lord and Lady Amberley; Lady Bowring; Miss F. P. Cobbe; Rev. Llewellyn Davies; Mr. Charles Darwin; Professor Fawcett, M.P.; Mrs. Fawcett; Mr. Francis Galton; Mr. M. D. Hill, Bristol; Lady Anna Gore Langton; Sir Roderick Murchison; Miss Harriet Martineau; Rev. Dr. James Martineau; Lady Helena Newenham; Rev. Mark Pattison; Dr. Humphrey Sandwith; Dr. C. B. Scott, of Westminster School; Mr. and Mrs. Titus Salt; Mr. Sidgwick; Lady Emerson Tennant, etc. etc. etc.[3]

[1] See *Scotsman*, April 29, May 12 and 18, 1871.
[2] See *Scotsman*, April 20, 1871.
[3] See *Note S.*

Among those who had previously signed petitions to Parliament in favour of the medical education of women, were also Lord Frederick Cavendish, M.P., Prof. Sheldon Amos, Rev. Horatius Bonar, Rev. Stopford Brook, Rt. Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury, Prof. Huxley, Prof. Newman, Prof. Tyndall, Prof. Bonamy Price, Lord Houghton, Mr. Norman Lockyer, Rev. Canon Kingsley, Rt. Rev. Bishop of St. David's (Thirlwall), Sir Fairfax Moresby, G.C.B.; Rt. Hon. Earl of Dufferin; Prof. Roscoe; and many others too numerous to mention.[1]

While public feeling at large was thus roused in our favour, the process subsequently known as "boycotting" was being carried out very successfully in Edinburgh, and, as happened often both before and since, we owed perhaps quite as much to our foes as to our friends. Those who undertake the conduct of public contests should certainly pray to be gifted with a sense of the ludicrous, and we often had occasion for thankfulness at the conspicuous absence of this quality among most of our opponents. At the close of the Winter Session, it appeared that the women had again been indiscreet and perverse enough to make their appearance in the prize-lists, and it was solemnly announced that "neither the President of the College of Physicians nor the President of the College of Surgeons would preside at the proceedings *if lady students were to be present and to receive their prizes on this occasion.*"[2] The result

[1] See *Note T.*

[2] *Scotsman*, March 11, 1871.

was that the usual public prize-giving had to be abandoned, and the prizes distributed in each class privately; but as this did not alter the facts of the case, nor prevent the usual publication of the prize-lists in the papers, it was a little difficult to see what was gained by this very remarkable proceeding.[1] Probably, however, the real object was to frighten the extra-mural lecturers, who were to some extent dependent on the favour of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and in point of fact a motion was brought forward at their meeting to rescind all privileges hitherto granted to the women, though it was ultimately determined to let the question remain open until the end of the Summer Session, as classes had already been arranged for the summer.[2]

[1] "After this the public will probably estimate at their true worth the opinions of doctors as to 'mixed classes;' for the delicacy of these gentlemen who cannot contemplate with equanimity the distribution of prizes to an audience of both sexes, must really be so very transcendental that most common-sense people will give up the attempt even to follow their line of argument. But if the thing has its intensely comic side, there is at the same time something very sad in seeing men who should be the guides and examples of youth, display such despicable *animus* and such extraordinary feebleness of judgment. The doctors seem to have resolved to throw away even the pretence of fairness and courtesy, and to resolve on war to the knife. . . . PALMAM QUI MERUIT FERAT."

—*Scotsman*, March 14, 1871.

[2] "In one quarter there was manifested a tendency to push on a motion for their exclusion. There seemed to be a desire on the part of certain gentlemen present to forward the views of those Managers of the Infirmary who are antagonists to the admission of the ladies to that institution, by affording them an opportunity of saying, when the question comes up next Monday for decision, that ladies were now excluded from every portion of the School, and that, such being the case, there was no occasion to provide them with facilities for Hospital attendance."—*Scotsman*, March 11, 1871.

The next event of importance was that an action for libel was brought against me by the student to whom I had alluded as Dr. Christison's class-assistant, at the January meeting of the Infirmary.[1] When I first had notice of this action, I wished to plead the substantial truth of my statement; but, being of course ignorant of Scotch law, I was overruled by my counsel, among whom was the Lord Advocate of Scotland (Young), on the ground that I could not *personally* prove the truth of what I had said, as indeed I did not know the young man by sight, and it would be held an aggravation of the injury to plead the "*veritas*" in a matter which was, after all, only one of hearsay. I was assured that if the case came to trial, abundant opportunity would be given to prove the young man's real conduct in the matter. The trial came on in May 1871; and, as the choice of the judge lies with the plaintiff in Scotland, it was brought before Lord Mure, whose sympathies were well known to be by no means on our side. It was at once apparent that he intended, so far as possible, to rule out all evidence that would tend to incriminate the plaintiff, on the ground that, as I had not "pleaded *veritas*," I could not now raise such an issue; indeed, in the summing up, Lord Mure charged the jury that "under the issue, as framed and sent to trial, they *must assume the falsehood* of the charges that had been made."[2]

It is of course impossible for me to say where lay the

[1] See *Note U.*

[2] *Scotsman*, June 1, 1871.

true law of the matter, but it was at once evident that, under such ruling, the jury had no alternative,—in fact, it has always been impossible for me to see what issue was really left to try. As, however, the plaintiff's counsel did not venture to put him into the witness-box, and as, when put there by my counsel, the judge would not allow him to be questioned as to his whereabouts and actions on the day of the riot, the jury formed a shrewd conclusion as to the facts of the case, and, though they found for the plaintiff, they awarded him only One Farthing damages![1]

It transpired ultimately that even this verdict had only been given after the jury had been assured by the Clerk of the Court that such nominal damages would not make me liable for the costs of the trial;[2] but the Clerk appears not to have been aware that, by giving a special certificate, the judge could still throw the costs upon me; and this was actually done. These costs amounted to £915, 11s. 1d. I was not, however, allowed to pay a penny of them myself. On July 28th, a few ladies and gentlemen put a very short advertisement in the paper, announcing their willingness to receive contributions for this purpose; and on August 31st they had occasion to advertise again, begging that no more money might be sent to them, as they already had more than was required. At a public meeting[3] shortly afterwards the amount of costs was handed to

[1] *Scotsman*, May 31 and June 1, 1871. [2] *Scotsman*, July 13, 1871.
[3] *Scotsman*, October 10, 1871. See *Note V.*

me, with also a surplus of £112, which I begged permission to add to the nucleus of a fund for a future Hospital for Women, to be opened some day in Edinburgh. A few weeks previously (just after the trial) a lady, "whose interest was excited by indignation," had already handed me a wholly unsolicited cheque for £200 for the same purpose, or indeed for any other for which it might be needed in connection with the struggle that was awakening such generous sympathy in chivalrous hearts. It is no little gratification to me to be able to say that now (1886) both these sums have, with their accumulations of interest, been employed for just the purpose intended, and have laid the foundation of the "Edinburgh Hospital for Women and Children,"—the first hospital opened in Scotland under the charge of medical women.[1]

Public attention and interest was in fact thoroughly aroused. When we first entered the University, comparatively little was known about the matter; but the refusal of the Hope Scholarship to Miss Pechey, the riot at Surgeons' Hall, our exclusion from the Royal Infirmary, and now this trial with its attendant circumstances, had attracted very wide attention and sympathy. What had appeared to be at first a mere academical or professional matter, was found to involve wide questions of justice, and indeed of public decency,

[1] There is still a mortgage for £400 upon this little hospital, but I trust that we shall be enabled, by the kindness of friends, to set it free within a year or two.

for the conduct of the lowest class of students had during the past few months been such as to excite universal indignation. Not content with wrenching off my bell-pull, or injuring my name-plate, no less than five times,[1] they had further distinguished themselves by affixing a catherine-wheel to my door and burning off a good share of the paint, with risk, of course, of much more serious mischief. These, however, were merely the tricks of utterly unmannerly boys; and, when they did not proceed to personal violence, we could on the same ground forgive some half-dozen of the lowest students for standing about in the doorways through which we had to pass, smoking in our faces, bursting into horse laughs at our approach, etc. But this was not all. The filthiest possible anonymous letters were sent to several of us by post; and the climax was reached when students took to waylaying us in some of the less-frequented streets through which we had to pass, and shouting indecencies after us, making use, sometimes, of anatomical terms which they knew we could not fail to understand, while the police were equally certain not to do so. This abominable practice was brought before the University Senatus by an indignant Professor, but it was decided that nothing could be done, because the students were in no way under College control except during class hours,—a tolerably important fact to be remembered when the Scotch Universities are

[1] *Scotsman*, May 9, 1871.

next under public review. As a matter of fact, this particular infamy, however, was effectually stopped by a letter from Miss Pechey, giving full publicity to the facts,[1] and by the known resolution of the police to capture and deal with the offenders. Fortunately a ruffian is usually also a coward.

In this way a publicity and prominence had been given to the whole matter, that would otherwise have been as impossible as undesirable, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that society in Edinburgh was almost split up into two sections, according to the views taken respecting the rights or wrongs of the lady students on the one side, or of the "medical clique" on the other.[2] The publicity given to the whole matter, and the strong sense of justice in the community at large, was indeed our best hope in the matter.

With each succeeding session new students joined our small class, partly in consequence of the very kind encouragement held out by Lady Amberley, Dr. Garrett Anderson, and other friends, in the way of scholarships; for, since public indignation was excited by the refusal of the Hope Scholarship to Miss Pechey, hardly a term has passed without some generous offer of valuable prizes for those ladies who needed such assistance to pursue their studies, and who, by their success in competitive examinations, showed themselves worthy of them. Such kindness was the more valuable

[1] *Scotsman*, July 14, 1871. See *Note W.* [2] See *Note X.*

at a time when, by incessant delays and constantly-recurring difficulties, every effort was evidently being made to exhaust alike the patience and the purses of the troublesome women who desired to complete the work they had begun.

It is not necessary for me to enter into details respecting the ladies' progress in their studies, further than to state that in every course in which they competed for prizes, more than half of the whole class were in the honours list, and in some cases every lady student so appeared;[1] so that any refusal to grant them further instruction could hardly be based on the plea that they had not done their best to avail themselves of what was already afforded.

I am sorry to have to record that at the end of the Summer Session, the lecturers at Surgeons' Hall agreed by a majority "to rescind the permission given last summer to those lecturers who desired it to admit ladies to their classes." An amendment was proposed that lecturers should be allowed to have *separate* classes for ladies. On a vote being taken, a majority decided in favour of complete prohibition; "it being, however, understood that the prohibition should not extend to the instructions by Dr. Keiller, or others, of *women who were not registered students of medicine.*"[2] This was plain speaking with a vengeance; and I think the motion would hardly have been so worded, had the

[1] See *Note Y.*

[2] *Scotsman*, July 19, 1871.

medical clique realized the manner in which it would be taken up by the public press.

In judging of the matter, I should like my readers to keep in view the testimony borne to the women-students by their teachers, Dr. Handyside, Dr. Watson, and others, as without such evidence the natural supposition would certainly be that they had in some way forfeited the privileges now taken from them.[1]

It must of course be understood that this vote only applied to Surgeons' Hall, and by no means bound the general body of extra-mural lecturers, if any of them chose (as some subsequently did) to lecture to us elsewhere. But it threw the whole burden upon us of separate arrangements and special fees in every case.

During the two years 1869–70 and 1870–1871, the five original students, who entered in 1869, had completed the first half of their University course, partly by attendance on separate classes in the University, and partly by means of extra-mural lectures. But at the end of these two years a dead-lock appeared imminent. The rules of the University forbid any student to take more than four classes outside the walls, and those four classes we had already taken. Professor Christison and others, whose classes came next in turn, gave a curt refusal to our request for instruction, although we again offered to guarantee any fee that might be required. In this dilemma we applied for help to the Senatus, and suggested that, if

[1] See *Notes O and GG.*

no other means could be devised, the difficulty might be solved in either of two ways,—(1) by appointment of special University lecturers (assistants to the Professors, or others), whose payment we would guarantee; or (2) by the relaxation in our case of the ordinary regulations, so that we might take an increased number of extra-mural classes. When these proposals came before the Senatus, it was decided to take a legal opinion as to the rights and powers of the University; and an opinion adverse to our interests having been given, the Senatus decided, on July 28th, 1871, by a majority of one, that they would take *no action* in the matter.

In these circumstances, the Committee of friends which had been formed for our assistance, caused a statement of the facts to be drawn up and submitted to other counsel, and obtained from the Lord Advocate and Sheriff Fraser an opinion to the following effect:—That it was quite competent to the University authorities to make any necessary provision for the completion of the ladies' education; and that the Medical Faculty were bound to admit the ladies to professional Examination on the subjects in which they were already qualified to pass.[1]

I must explain that the advice of counsel had been asked on this last point, in consequence of a rumour that difficulties might be made respecting the Examination that was now due at the end of two years of

[1] See *Note Z.*

professional study. The first official notice on this subject was, however, received by us on Saturday, October 14th, after the fees for such Examination had been paid, and tickets of admission obtained; the Examination itself being due on the 24th of the same month, and the ladies concerned having studied for two years with the view of passing this Examination, for which they had more especially been preparing assiduously for the last six months.

On the following Monday, October 16th, 1871, I, moreover, received an official notice that the Dean of the Medical Faculty had been interdicted by the Faculty from giving to ladies any papers for the Preliminary Examination in Arts, which was to take place *on the following day*, October 17! Three ladies had come up to Edinburgh from different parts of the country with the express object of passing these Examinations, and, if prevented from doing so, they would be retarded in their studies to the extent of one year. The excessive shortness of the notice given made it impossible even to appeal to the Senatus, and the only course open to me was to submit the facts for the opinion of counsel. This was done, and we were informed that the course taken by the Medical Faculty was quite illegal, while an express invitation to lady students formed part of the official Calendar of the University.[1] This opinion was forwarded to the Dean, and I am sure that he was glad by it to be released

[1] See *Note AA.*

from the painful necessity of obeying the Medical Faculty in this matter. The ladies were accordingly examined in the ordinary course.

But the excitements of the month were not yet at an end. On applying for matriculation tickets, the ladies were informed by the Clerk that the Principal, Sir Alexander Grant, had written him word that, in consequence of representations made to him by Professor Christison, he desired that no ladies should at present be allowed to matriculate. On this point, and that regarding the Professional Examination, we of course appealed at once to the Senatus. At the meeting at which our appeal was considered, "the Committee for securing complete Medical Education for Women in Edinburgh" also presented the opinion obtained by them from counsel, together with a letter urging that complete provision should be made for our instruction. At their meeting on October 21st, the Senatus at once decided both points of appeal in our favour. The Principal's prohibition, which had never had any legal weight, was overruled, and the permission to women to matriculate and pass the Arts Examinations was renewed, and declared to be in force so long as the present regulations stood in the Calendar. The Medical Faculty also were instructed at once to admit the ladies who were prepared for it to the Professional Examination on the following day; and I am happy to say that, in spite of the incessant worry to which they had been subjected for the past

ten days, they all passed successfully. I am sure that all those who have had to prepare for severe University Examinations will appreciate the difficulties under which they did so.[1]

A few days later came a meeting of the University Council, when Dr. Alexander Wood made a gallant attempt to get a vote passed, to the effect that "the University is bound, in honour and justice, to render it possible for those women who have already commenced their studies, to complete them."[2] The *Lancet* remarked respecting this motion:—"This is precisely the ground we have always taken up about the matter; and we hope that the General Council of the University will, by the adoption of Dr. Alexander Wood's motion, put an end to the controversy which had redounded so little to the credit of that school."[3] A memorial in

[1] On a subsequent very similar occasion the *Scotsman* remarked:—"It may be noticed that this is the third time that startling announcements have been fired at the lady students on the very eve of important Examinations, possibly with the professional view of testing the soundness of their nerves."—*Scotsman*, March 21, 1872.

[2] The text of the resolution was as follows:—"That, in the opinion of this Council, the University authorities have, by published resolutions, induced women to commence the study of medicine at the University; that these women, having prosecuted their studies to a certain length, are prevented from completing them from want of adequate provision being made for their instruction; that this Council, without again pronouncing any opinion on the advisability of women studying medicine, do represent to the University Court that, after what the Senatus and Court have already done, they are at least bound, in honour and justice, to render it possible for those women who have already commenced their studies, to complete them."

[3] *Lancet*, October 28, 1871.

favour of the resolution was also presented, signed by more than nine thousand women, residing in all parts of the country, and representing almost every rank in society.[1] Very vigorous opposition to it was, however, made by Professors Turner, Thomson, and Christison, all of whom were members of the Medical Faculty; and ultimately an amendment, which proposed to leave the question to be settled by the Senatus and University Court, was carried by 107 votes to 97.[2]

At a meeting of the Senatus, held on Oct. 30th, the question of making further provision for the instruction of women was brought forward, and a letter was received from the Committee of our friends, stating

[1] I am assured by Mrs. Henry Kingsley, who kindly acted as Hon. Secretary to this memorial, that the signatures might have been multiplied tenfold, had any organized effort been made to obtain them by means of paid agents taking the papers from house to house.

[2] "The Edinburgh school has come badly out of its imbroglio with the lady students. The motion of Dr. Alexander Wood, to which we made reference last week, was negatived by a majority of ten. As we then pointed out, the issue before the General Council was neither more nor less than this,—to keep faith with the female students whom the University had allowed to proceed two years in their medical curriculum. The Council was not asked to commit itself in the slightest degree to any opinion, favourable or unfavourable, to the admission of ladies to a medical career. It had only to concede, in common courtesy, not to say common fairness, the right to which the best legal advice had clearly shown the female students to be entitled,—the right to carry on the studies they had been allowed to prosecute half-way towards graduation. Will it be believed? An amendment postponing the settlement of the difficulty till it had been duly considered by the authorities of the University, was put and carried; as if there was any more room for 'consideration' in the matter! Thus Edinburgh stands convicted of having acted unfairly towards seven ladies, whom she first accepted as pupils, and then stopped half-way in their career."—*Lancet*, Nov. 4, 1871.

that, "in the event of special lecturers being appointed by the University to give qualifying instruction to women, the Committee are willing to guarantee the payment to them of any sum that may be fixed by the Senatus for their remuneration, in case the fees of the ladies are insufficient for that purpose; and that, if necessary, they are willing further to undertake to provide such rooms and accommodation as may be required for the delivery of the said lectures, if it should be found absolutely impossible for the University to provide space for that purpose." After a long debate, the Senatus decided, by a majority, that they would not take any steps to enable us to complete our education. At a meeting a few days later, the Senatus further decided, by fourteen votes to thirteen, to recommend to the University Court that the existing regulations in favour of female students be rescinded, without prejudice, however, to the rights of those already studying. This resolution was, as I said, passed by fourteen votes to thirteen; and it may be worth while to mention that two of the fourteen votes were those of Dr. Christison and Sir Alexander Grant, who were themselves members of the University Court, to which the recommendation was to be made. That the proposed measure was not the wish of a real majority of the Professors, was soon made abundantly clear, for a protest against it was sent up to the Court, signed by eighteen out of the thirty-five Professors of the University, while two out of the remaining seven-

teen were persistently neutral, never indeed having voted on the question from first to last.[1] In the teeth of this protest, it was of course almost impossible that the regulations could be rescinded, and so they were once more confirmed by the University Court, on January 3rd, 1872.

It is worth remark that in the foregoing discussion it was again distinctly brought out that the hostility of the medical clique was directed, not against women as such, but against such women as were registered students of medicine.[2] Professor Bennett having stated that he desired, for the sake of the medical Professors themselves, that women should not be excluded, as he had himself received fees from them to the extent of £160 during this year (1871–72), Professor Muirhead distinctly said that "he did not speak of the amateurs attending Professor Bennett's lectures,—*the question was as to those who wanted to qualify for graduation.*"[3]

[1] These eighteen were Professors Balfour, Bennett, Blackie, Calderwood, Charteris, Crawford, Fraser, Geikie, Hodgson, Innes, Jenkin, Kelland, Lorimer, Liston, Masson, Stevenson, Tait, Wilson. The two neutrals were Professors Oakeley and Piazzi Smith. The remaining fifteen were made up of ten Medical Professors, viz. Crum Brown, Christison, Laycock, Lister, Maclagan, Sanders, Simpson, Spence, Turner, Thomson; and of five others, who supported them with more or less consistency, viz. Muirhead, Macpherson, Tytler, Sellar, and Aufrecht.

[2] *Scotsman*, Dec. 22, 1871.

[3] "There is no objection to women studying medicine and science in the University, so long as the only result of their doing so is the pocketing of fees on the part of the Professors. But when by graduating and qualifying for the practice of their profession, there is a possible result of the ladies pocketing fees themselves,—which at present may go into the pockets of medical Professors,—then there is the greatest possible

Another point clearly defined was that the hostile medical Professors claimed not only the right to refuse to instruct women themselves (for which want of time was often the plea), but also the right to forbid their assistants to do so in their name and by their authority. Had this latter plan been adopted, the whole difficulty could at this moment have been solved with perfect ease. From first to last there was no great difficulty in our getting instruction from competent men in any subject we required, but an insuperable obstacle lay in our path, in the fact that *only four extra-mural classes were allowed to qualify for graduation*, and this number we had already exhausted. It was by no means uncommon for the assistant or representative of a Professor to give a "qualifying" course in his stead,[1] by permission of the Senatus; but of course this could only be done with the good-will of the Professor, and good-will was unfortunately the last thing available. During this very session I had implored Professor Crum Brown to allow his assistant, Mr. Dewar, to give a course to the junior members of our class, as it was well known Mr. Dewar was most willing to do so; but the Professor's veto

objection to their studying. Here we have a University Professor unblushingly placing against the settlement of a great public question, the pecuniary interests of certain professional men. And yet these men would shake their heads and prate of the necessity of stamping out trades-unionism amongst workmen!"—*Daily Review*, Dec. 23, 1871.

[1] This was done, for I think three successive years, when Professor Wyville Thompson was absent on the *Challenger* expedition, and frequently in other cases of illness or unavoidable absence.

was interposed, and was of course final.[1] An attempt was subsequently made to show that it was want of health and time that prevented Dr. Crum Brown from assisting us further, but I was able to prove the contrary, both by the facts just narrated, and by the equally significant circumstance that the Professor found himself quite able during the next session to give a course to *non-professional lady students*.[2]

Fortunately, through the kindness of Dr. Stevenson Macadam, we were able to secure in the Extra-Mural School a course of chemistry, at least equal to that which we desired to attend in the University, but this

[1] "We understand that the Professor of Chemistry, who delivered to the ladies a course of lectures during the first session, and found five-sixths of them in his prize-lists at the end, has this year not only refused to lecture to their successors, but has also actually refused to allow his assistant to instruct them in chemical testing, etc., although it is notorious that the room allotted to Practical Chemistry is but little used during the winter session, and that the assistant in question had abundant time and abundant good-will at the service of the ladies, and that the granting of this boon would not have cost the Professor a single hour of his own time."—*Scotsman*, March 25, 1872.

"It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the authorities of the University of Edinburgh are less concerned about the diffusion of learning, than careful to act in the interests of trades-unionism. . . . This is the dog in the manger policy, against which an emphatic protest is now raised."—*Manchester Examiner and Times*, March 29, 1872.

[2] *Scotsman*, August 27 and September 1, 1873. This correspondence was elicited by the fact that the editor had been cruel enough to say in a leading article that it had been "found that even medical Professors can find time to lecture to ladies, provided the ladies have no professional designs, or, as we may say, designs on the profession."

—*Scotsman*, August 26, 1873.

inevitably left us face to face with the difficulty above referred to.

The next event of importance was the annual re-election of Infirmary Managers, six of whom were to be chosen at the Contributors' Meeting at the beginning of January 1872. As on a former occasion, the election evidently turned wholly on our admission to, or exclusion from, the Infirmary wards. The medical party moved the re-election of the former Managers, and they were sure of the support of everybody who did not consider our admission a vital question. Our friends, on the contrary, brought forward a list of gentlemen, all of whom were known to be friendly to our cause. After a very warm debate, the list of our friends proved to be successful, being supported by 177 votes, while 168 were recorded on the other side. Professor Masson then moved that a statute be enacted by the Court of Contributors, giving the same educational advantages in the Infirmary to female as to male students. The hostile party, finding themselves in a minority, endeavoured to prevent this being put to the vote, on technical grounds, which were subsequently found to be of no legal importance. Failing in this, they then adopted the remarkably dignified course of decamping in a body, accompanied by ironical cheers from those left behind. In the lull that succeeded, Professor Masson brought forward his motion, which was seconded by the Rev. Dr. Guthrie, and passed without a dissentient voice. I believe I

am correct in saying that this was Dr. Guthrie's last appearance at a public meeting, and no one present is ever likely to forget the appearance of that venerable figure, drawn up to the full height of his unusual stature, as he indignantly exclaimed that "it seemed to him monstrous that when the country committed the fortune of the State to a woman's hand, women should not be trusted with administering a dose of physic or preparing a blister." Then, in a tone of enthusiasm, he prophesied the dawn of better things, and waved his hand with dramatic action to the door by which our foes had disappeared, exclaiming as a peroration, received with deafening cheers,[1]—

> "Ring out the old, ring in the new,
> Ring out the false, ring in the true!"

This statute therefore became actually law in the Infirmary, and, considering that Managers friendly to us had also been elected, it might have been thought that our difficulties there were at end. But now comes the most extraordinary part of the whole story. On a scrutiny of the votes, it was found that with the majority had voted twenty-eight firms, thirty-one ladies, and seven doctors. On the other side were fourteen firms, two ladies, thirty-seven doctors, and three druggists. These figures may seem, indeed, to have a tolerable moral significance, but it is not with that that I am at this moment concerned. It occurred

[1] *Scotsman*, January 2, 1872.

to the defeated party that here might be found a straw for them, drowning, to catch at,—that possibly a legal objection might be sustained against the votes of firms which were so largely in our favour, and that, if so, the victory might yet be secured![1] The result was, that when the Contributors assembled at the adjourned meeting,[2] for the purpose of hearing the result of the scrutiny and the final declaration of the election, the Lord Provost found himself served with an interdict forbidding him to declare the new Managers duly elected, on the ground that the votes of firms were incompetent, and that by means of these the majority had been obtained!

Instances have occurred before now where personal feelings have triumphed over public interests, but I do not think that I ever heard of quite so reckless a

[1] "It mattered nothing that firms had voted ever since the Infirmary was founded; that contributors qualified only as members of firms had, as has now been ascertained, sat over and over again on the Board of Management, and on the Committee of Contributors. It was of equally slight importance that the firms whom it was now sought to disqualify had been among the most generous benefactors of the charity, and that, with the imminent prospect before them of great pecuniary necessity, it would probably be impossible, without their aid, to carry out even the plans for the new building. The firms had voted in favour of the ladies, and the firms must go, if at least the law would (as it probably will not) bear out the medical men in their reckless endeavour to expel them."

—*Scotsman*, January 29, 1872.

[2] At this meeting a Committee of Contributors, previously appointed, reported in favour of the admission of lady students, and against the exclusion of the votes of firms, and this report was approved by 232 votes to 227. On this occasion there voted for the approval of the report 41 ladies and 10 doctors; against it, 6 ladies, 44 doctors, and 5 druggists.

course as this, by which the medical clique plunged the great Edinburgh Hospital into litigation, and that with some of its own most generous supporters, rather than allow a dozen women to obtain in its wards the instruction that the Contributors had decreed they should receive![1]

An attempt was made to set in motion again the machinery so successfully used last year, and a petition was started and "handed about vigorously in class-rooms, and left to lie on the counters of medical book-shops, but, alas! events would not repeat themselves. Even the students seem to have got ashamed of this persistent persecution, . . . and the mass of students simply would not sign. The number of names obtained has been so small, that the petition has ignominiously died a natural death, to the profound wrath of certain medical Professors, who may be heard descanting bitterly on 'this disgraceful apathy of the students.'"[2]

In the subsequent history of the Infirmary battle we had a fine instance of what Charles Reade would have called the "Postponement Swindle." As Managers were elected for one year only, it was of course of vital importance that our question should be settled during

[1] "They have recklessly hurled the chief hospital of Scotland on the spikes of a fierce controversy, and that not for any object or purpose connected with its own interests, but solely because in their resolute defence of their profession against the desecration of female invasion, the Infirmary formed a convenient earthwork behind which to entrench themselves."
—*Scotsman*, January 29, 1872.

[2] *Scotsman*, January 31, 1872. See also *Note BB.*

the twelve months for which a majority in our favour had been elected expressly with this view. Every effort was used to prevent this result. The interdict prevented the Lord Provost from declaring the new Managers elected until the legal question should be settled. On February 3rd the interdict was "continued" by the Lord Ordinary (Mackenzie). By one means or another the legal proceedings were protracted until July 23rd, when Lord Jerviswoode (in accordance with an opinion already given by Sir Roundell Palmer) pronounced the votes of firms to be perfectly valid,[1] as indeed nobody had ever doubted before the last Infirmary meeting. Further delay was however gained by an appeal[2] against this decision; the case did not come up for trial until October 29th, and then was again postponed, so that judgment was not finally given until December 7th, 1872, when less than a month remained of the year for which the friendly Managers (*now* declared legally elected) had been entitled to sit! One more postponement was obtained, on the plea that these Managers had not been "declared elected" by the Contributors (the Lord Provost having been interdicted from so declaring), and a Contributors' Meeting for this purpose had to be held on December 16th, when just a fortnight of the year remained! The margin was narrow enough, but it was made sufficient. The friendly Managers being now in a majority, a vote was passed on Monday,

[1] *Scotsman*, July 24, 1872.
[2] *Scotsman*, September 2, 1872.

December 23rd, admitting the lady students to the Infirmary, on the twofold condition that their attendance was to be "separate," and that they were only to go to those wards where their presence was invited by the physicians and surgeons,—*i.e.* to only about 80 beds, or less than one-sixth of the whole. Still the great point was gained; we got our tickets, and were enabled to begin an attendance which would "qualify" for graduation.[1]

The extreme importance of our having gained even so much was shown, when at the next Infirmary meeting a less favourable list of Managers was elected by a very small majority[2] (279 to 271), and from that time no more concessions were to be had, and it taxed the utmost efforts of our friends to prevent the loss of what we had already gained. By insisting on "separate classes" at the bedside (the absurdity of which, while female nurses were employed,[3] was known to none better than to the medical Managers) an enormous difficulty was thrown in our way, as it was in the highest degree difficult for busy medical men to give double time to a needless repetition of the Hospital visit. Thanks, however, to the great kindness of Dr. George W. Balfour and of Dr. Heron Watson, these difficulties were so far overcome as to enable us to attend sufficiently to obtain the usual certificates, though our opportunities were meagre indeed when

[1] *Scotsman*, December 24 and 31, 1872.
[2] *Scotsman*, January 7, 1873.
[3] See *Note II.*

compared with those which ought to be given to every student of medicine. Dr. Balfour gave us a separate hour in his wards three times a week, and such chances of practical study as could be arranged from time to time. Dr. Watson's very large practice, as the most eminent surgeon in Scotland, made it impossible for him, at whatever inconvenience, to repeat his visit in this manner, and our enemies would have gained their point, had he not, with kindness which I find myself even now quite unable to acknowledge duly, given up for two whole winter sessions his Sunday mornings (his one day of rest) to our instruction, while steadily refusing to accept any fees whatever for this great sacrifice of his time and strength. Few more chivalrous acts were ever done, and I only hope that he found his reward in the life-long gratitude of a dozen women, who were not at that moment too much accustomed to such kindness and courtesy as his.

To wind up at once this section of the subject, I may say that it was a matter of course that our opponents should try to turn to account the national Sabbatarianism, and should do their best to deprive us of our one chance on this ground; but the then Lord Provost (James Cowan) accompanied us on one of the Sunday visits, and then bore such testimony to the "truly Sabbatic work" of healing, that the medical clique were silenced; and, after various conferences, a motion permitting the arrangements was carried by 11 votes to 6.[1] A further

[1] *Scotsman*, February 19, 1873.

effort was made by Dr. Watson to obtain our admission to some at least of his operations; but though it was proposed to place us alone in an upper gallery, "screened out of sight of the male students," but yet in a position to see the operating table, this permission was sternly refused by 8 to 6 votes, the Lord Provost declining to vote till he could learn how the presence of the ladies "would affect the body of students generally!"[1]

While completing the history of the Infirmary contest, I have not paused to mention the difficulties which met us with reference to Dispensary practice, which was also required by the regulations for graduation. In October 1871 we had applied to the Royal Dispensary for admission as students, but after our application had been bandied about between the Committee and medical officers for nearly three weeks, they sent us word on November 17th that it was "too late" to do anything for the winter session. We then applied for admission to the Cowgate "Medical Mission Dispensary," where there was a large practice, and a good many medical officers, with only I think eight students. The superintendent, Rev. John Lowe, M.D., was friendly, and thought it could be managed, especially as one of the doctors had as a rule no students present on his days, and was willing to receive us. We hoped we had gained our point, when the "missionary" students bethought them to send in a petition to the Committee, begging

[1] *Scotsman*, December 16, 17, and 18, 1873.

them not to admit women (one of whom, by the bye, desired herself to be a missionary); and the Committee actually, in compliance with this truly Christian request, refused our application! Under the circumstances this did seem rather too hard, and we tried our best to get the decision altered. I called on one of the principal clerical managers, Rev. Mr. Cullen, and begged his assistance; but he replied that they "had all come to the conclusion it was better not to complicate their own object by taking up a disputed matter, etc." I am afraid I so far forgot myself as to reply that "I had no doubt that that was exactly the point of view of the priest and Levite when they passed by on the other side."

In May 1872 we renewed our application to the Royal Dispensary, and its success or failure was found to turn on the question whether any medical officer would be willing to give up his class of male students, and teach us only. I shall never forget the kindness of Dr. Peel Ritchie, to whom I applied in this emergency, who told me frankly that he did not much approve of the study of medicine by women, but that he thought it thoroughly wrong that when once admitted to the University they should be thus incessantly impeded by minor obstacles, and therefore he was willing to do what we desired.[1]

[1] I am thankful to say that Dr. Ritchie's sympathy with medical women has increased as he has seen more of their work, and I have now the honour of his co-operation as one of the consulting staff of my little Hospital for Women and Children, opened in 1885.

As nothing which increased the interest of the general public can be foreign to the subject, I can hardly omit to mention that on April 26th, 1872, I delivered the earlier part of the present paper, as a lecture, in St. George's Hall, London, under the presidency of the venerable Earl of Shaftesbury. The chairman remarked that "the argument that women were not wanted in the medical profession struck him as very singular. He was old enough to remember when railways and electric telegraphs were 'not wanted,' for the simple reason that they were not known. When they became known and tried we could not do without them, and in all probability it would be the same with reference to ladies in the medical profession. . . . The conduct of the young men who had so wantonly assailed the ladies, he considered brutal, and disgraceful to modern Athens. But he encouraged the ladies to persevere, by reminding them that persecution was often of the greatest benefit, and expressed his conviction that their courage and perseverance would end in a brilliant victory."

It would be impossible to exaggerate the value of such kindly sympathy and encouragement at such a time, and indeed nothing was more remarkable than the number of unknown friends who came forward during the next few months to help us in various ways. Mr. Walter Thomson, who was till then a complete stranger to me, called one day to ask what was the present position of affairs, and to say that he wished to give me £1000, to be spent for the cause in whatever way I

thought most useful. I begged him to place a part of the money in the hands of the Committee already referred to, and to allow me to use the rest for scholarships, or free tickets, for students needing such assistance. With the cheque he sent also a paper stating his reasons for giving it.[1] Who shall say that the spirit of chivalry is among the things of the past?

A great many expressions of sympathy in the press and otherwise reached us also about this time, in consequence of the publication of the first edition of *Medical Women.* The much briefer sketch given in it was yet a revelation to many in all parts of the country, who had no idea that men calling themselves gentlemen, and belonging to a so-called liberal profession, could have treated a handful of women in the way described. It is difficult to exaggerate the value of the kindness and encouragement given to us at such a time.[2]

A little later also I delivered a lecture on our

[1] Among other reasons, he stated, "because I feel that the *right* of women to the higher as well as to the lower branches of medical education is a matter of simple justice and fair-play. Because, as to the reasons assigned for the opposition, and still more as to the manner in which it has been carried on in Edinburgh, I feel utterly ashamed of the conduct and opinion in this matter of some of my own sex. . . . Because some who realize the advantage which must result to humanity from the removal of such restrictions are sparing themselves no effort or sacrifice, devoting their best energies and means to the work, and I therefore feel assured that others will unite with me in supplying the funds which in our day are an essential aid to all who have to contend against monopoly and prejudice."
—*Scotsman*, October 14, 1872.

[2] See *Note CC.*

experiences in the Literary Institute of Edinburgh, and found it crammed to the doors with an almost entirely sympathetic audience, to whom I ventured to say,—

"Professor Campbell of St. Andrews recently made a remark, for which I think he deserves our thanks—viz. that one argument urged against women was that they have not the physical or mental strength for the wear and tear of the medical profession, whereas it seemed to him that our opponents had done their best to dispose of this argument themselves, by putting us to a test which might well be considered conclusive. I think so too. Like the Jews of old, we have had to build our temple with the sword in one hand and the trowel in the other; we have had now to study a science, and now to defend a lawsuit; one moment to write an examination paper, and the next to plead our cause before the public; to spend a night perhaps at the bedside of a dispensary patient, and to be busied all the next day to defeat the last dodge of the Medical Faculty to deprive us altogether of opportunities of instruction; and all the time to find that the gossips of the town are enlivening their tea-tables and dinner parties with stories at our expense, which must have been very successful if their first hearers experienced half the astonishment we felt when at length they reached our ears! Surely it needed 'true feminine perversity' to resist at once so many lance-thrusts and so many gnat stings, while toiling up hill all the time with a tolerably heavy burden."

In the meantime I had, on behalf of my fellow-students and myself, appealed to the University Court to provide us with the means of completing our education, and our friends of the Committee also forwarded to the Court a further legal opinion from the Lord Advocate and Sheriff Fraser, to the effect that the University authorities had full powers to permit the matriculation of women in 1869; that the resolutions then passed amounted to a permission to women to "*study Medicine*" in the University, and that therefore the women concerned were entitled to demand the

means of doing so; and, finally, that if such means were persistently refused, the legal mode of redress lay in an Action of Declarator.[1]

On January 8th, 1872, the University Court declared that they could not make any arrangements to enable us to pursue our studies with a view to a degree, but that, *if we would altogether give up the question of graduation*,[2] and be content with certificates of proficiency, they would try to meet our views!

In reply, I represented to the Court that no "certificates" were recognised by the Medical Act, and that any such documents would therefore be perfectly useless to us. I further urged that as matriculation fees had been exacted from us, in addition to the fees for tuition, and as we had been required to pass the preliminary Examination "*for the medical degree*," and as some of our own number had, moreover, passed the first professional Examination, I could not but believe that we were entitled to demand the means of completing the ordinary University education, with a view to obtaining the ordinary degree; such belief being, moreover, confirmed by the emphatic opinion of very distinguished counsel. On these grounds I entreated the Court to re-

[1] See *Note Z.*

[2] In support of this suggestion, the Court remarked that the question had been needlessly "complicated by the introduction of the subject of graduation, which is not essential to the completion of a medical or other education." They *forgot*, however, to mention that though a degree is "not essential" to a medical education, it *is* absolutely indispensable to any practical use of it,—that is to say, to any lawful practice of the medical profession.

consider their decision, and, in the hope of facilitating a solution of the problem, I also made the following suggestion :—

"That, as the main difficulty before your honourable Court seems to be that regarding graduation, with which we are not immediately concerned at this moment, we are quite willing to rest our claims to ultimate graduation on the facts as they stand up to the present date ; and in case your honourable Court will now make arrangements whereby we can continue our education, we will undertake not to draw any arguments in favour of our right to graduation from such future arrangements, so that they may at least be made without prejudice to the present legal position of the University."

I appeal to every intelligent man and woman to say whether these words, taken in connection with my previous argument, were in the slightest degree ambiguous, or whether any doubt could really exist that in them I was pleading for facilities for such an education as would ultimately enable us to become legal practitioners of medicine, although I was willing that the actual question of graduation should remain in abeyance for a few months, till decided by legal authority, or otherwise. The public evidently so understood my letter, which was published in the papers, for it was considered that I had substantially gained my end, when the following reply from the secretary of the Court was also published :—

"I am desired to inform you that you appear to ask no more than was offered by the Court in their resolution of the 8th ultimo, in which it was stated that, while the Court were restrained by legal doubts as to the power of the University to grant degrees to women from considering 'the expediency of taking steps to obtain, in favour of female students, an alteration of an ordinance which might be held not to apply to women,' they were 'at the same time desirous to remove, so far as possible, any

present obstacle in the way of a complete medical education being given to women ; provided always that medical instruction to women be imparted in strictly separate classes.' On the assumption, therefore, that while you at present decline the offer made by the Court with reference to certificates of proficiency, you now ask merely that arrangements should be made for completing the medical education of yourself and the other ladies on behalf of whom you write, I am to state that the Court are quite ready to meet your views. If, therefore, the names of extra-academical teachers of the required medical subjects be submitted by yourself, or by the Senatus, the Court will be prepared to consider the respective fitness of the persons so named to be authorized to hold medical classes for women who have, in this or former sessions, been matriculated students of the University, and also the conditions and regulations under which such classes should be held. It is, however, to be distinctly understood that such arrangements are not to be founded on as implying any right in women to obtain medical degrees, or as conferring any such right upon the students referred to."

My friends, as I say, congratulated me on this apparently important concession ; but to make assurance doubly sure, I resolved to have absolute official confirmation of the apparent meaning of the resolution, and therefore addressed another letter to the Court, in which, after thanking them for their apparent good intentions, I enquired whether I was correct in understanding—

"1. That, though you at present give us no pledge respecting our ultimate graduation, it is your intention to consider the proposed extra-mural courses as 'qualifying' for graduation, and that you will take such measures as may be necessary to secure that they will be so accepted, if it is subsequently determined that the University has the power of granting degrees to women.

"2. That we shall be admitted in due course to the ordinary professional Examinations, on presentation of the proper certificates of attendance on the said extra-mural classes."

In reply, I was calmly informed that the Court meant

nothing of the kind; that they would not agree to count any classes we might take as qualifying; and that, in fact, they would not stir a finger in any way whatever to enable us to become legally-qualified doctors, though they might, if we spent a good many years of labour and a quite unlimited sum of money in obtaining our education, give us at the end these wonderful certificates of proficiency, which would be worth exactly—Nothing![1]

[1] "We have high authority for assuming that parents, when their children ask for bread, do not give them a stone, nor when they petition for a fish, put them off with a serpent. The *Alma Mater* of the ladies at Edinburgh seems, however, in this respect very much to resemble a step-mother. . . . Medical studies are not often pursued, we imagine, by either men or women without some definite purpose of turning them to use eventually in medical practice. It is therefore rather diverting to find the Edinburgh University Court blandly suggesting to settle all the difficulties about the lady students by allowing them to 'complete their medical education' provided they will be content to receive at the conclusion only 'certificates of proficiency,'—the said certificates being wholly worthless, since registration cannot be demanded by the holder, and without registration no one can legally practise medicine. Truly, since the male china painters refused to allow their female fellow-workers to use mahl-sticks, . . . no such instance of the worst form of trades-unionism has been heard of."

—*Echo*, January 11, 1872.

"The University Court is so anxious 'to remove as far as possible any present obstacle to a complete medical education being given to women,' that it is prepared to give certificates of proficiency instead of degrees. In fact, being asked for bread, it is so anxious to be generous that it most cordially offers a stone."—*Daily News*, January 1872.

"This is a most delicious proposal, and would have done Dogberry credit. The ladies ask the bread for which they have already paid the University, and are willing to pay more; and the Court replies that though it has advertised for and invited purchasers, it is in doubt if it has any of the article to sell; but if the ladies will take a stone instead, it will be most happy to do all that is possible to get it for them."

—*Examiner*, January 20, 1872.

What had been the meaning of the previous letter of apparent concession I confess myself quite at a loss to conceive. What advantage could accrue to us from submitting the names of extra-mural teachers to the Court, in which Professor Christison was the only medical man, I have never been able to guess, since the Court did not intend to take any means to make their teaching qualify for graduation, and we hardly needed its sanction in order to make private arrangements for non-qualifying instruction! One is inclined to wonder whether the idea was that the University Court possessed some supernatural power, analogous to that supposed by certain Churches to reside in episcopal laying on of hands, which would in a miraculous way benefit those lecturers whom they might "authorize" to teach us, though such teaching was to be given in place and manner wholly unconnected with that University with which I had supposed their functions to be exclusively connected. However, I am content to leave this among the unexplained mysteries, with very hearty thankfulness, that at least by timely enquiries we saved ourselves from a still more hopeless waste of time and money, which indeed we were on the point of incurring, in reliance on the good faith of the Court, and the apparent meaning of its mysterious resolution.[1]

Having, however, at length arrived at a certainty that the Medical Faculty would rest with nothing short of our expulsion, if by any possibility they could

[1] The correspondence above referred to is given in *Note DD.*

attain that end; that the Senatus, though far more friendly, had not a sufficient majority of liberal votes to secure the permanent concession of our claims, however just, in the teeth of the strong medical opposition; and that the University Court would offer only such concessions as were quite valueless for our end,—it became clear that it was useless to prolong the series of supplications which had, for nearly a year, been addressed in vain to one after another of the ruling powers of the University.

On the other hand, we had no less authority than that of the Lord Advocate of Scotland for believing that we were absolutely entitled to what we had so humbly solicited, and that a Court of law would quietly award to us what seemed unattainable by any other means; we had the very widely spread and daily increasing sympathy of the community at large, and received constant offers of help from friends of every kind, who were none the less inclined to befriend us because our opponents stood in high places, and were utterly relentless in their aims and reckless in their means. Under these circumstances, we did the one thing that remained for us to do, we brought an action of declarator against the Senatus of the University,—praying to have it declared that the Senatus was bound, in some way or other, to enable us to complete our education, and to proceed to the medical degree which would entitle us to take place on the Medical Register among the legally-qualified practitioners of

medicine. By this action it would be decided—once more to quote our great champion the *Scotsman*—whether, indeed, "a University can, with formal solemnity, and with the concurrence of all its component parts, decree the admission of women to study for the profession of medicine, and then deny them access to those means by which alone they can enter that profession; whether, indeed, a University is absolved from all duties towards such of its matriculated students as may have the misfortune to be women. It would have to be decided whether any corporate body can make a contract of which all the obligations are on one side, and can exact fees and demand obedience to regulations, without in its turn incurring any responsibility; and can at pleasure finally send empty away those whose presence is inconvenient, without any regard to the money and time and labour which they have expended, in simple reliance upon its good faith."[1]

It was a very great satisfaction to me to find that some of the most illustrious members of the Senatus expressed their own opinion on these points in the most emphatic way, for they refused utterly to be parties to the defence of this action, and they entered on the record a minute from which I extract the following passage:—

"We dissent from and protest against the resolution of the Senatus of March 27, 1872, to undertake the defence of the action. This we do

[1] *Scotsman*, March 25, 1872.

for the following reasons:—(1.) Because we see no just cause for opposing the admission of women to the study and practice of medicine; but, on the contrary, consider that women who have honourably marked out such a course of life for themselves, ought to be forwarded and aided in their laudable endeavour as much as possible, by all who have the means, and especially by those having authority in any University or other institution for education; (2.) Because, in particular, we feel such aid and encouragement, rather than opposition and discouragement, to be due from us to those women who have enrolled themselves in the University of Edinburgh, and we entirely concur, with respect to them, in the desire expressed by Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, the Rector of the University, that they should obtain what they ask—namely, a complete medical education, crowned by a degree; (3.) Because we have seen no sufficient reason to doubt the legal and constitutional powers of our University to make arrangements that would be perfectly adequate for the purpose, and we consider the public questioning of such powers, in present circumstances, by the University itself, or any of its component bodies, unnecessary, impolitic, and capable of being construed as a surrender of permanent rights and privileges of the University, in order to evade a temporary difficulty; (4.) Because, without pronouncing an opinion on the question now raised, as to the legal rights which the pursuers have acquired by matriculation in the University, admission already to certain examinations, or otherwise, to demand from the University continued medical instruction and the degree on due qualification, we yet believe that they have thereby, and by the general tenor of the proceedings, both of the Senatus and of the University Court in their case, hitherto acquired a moral right, and created a public expectation, which the University is bound to meet by the full exercise of its powers in their behalf, even should it be with some trouble; (5.) Because, with these convictions, and notwithstanding our utmost respect for those of our colleagues from whom we may have the misfortune to differ on the subject, we should individually feel ashamed of appearing as defenders in such an action, and should account any such public appearance by us in the character of opponents to women desiring to enter an honoured and useful profession, a matter to our discredit." [1]

The following are the names of the six Professors who have taken this memorable stand:—John Hughes Bennett, M.D., Professor of the Institutes of Medicine;

[1] *Scotsman*, May 7, 1872.

David Masson, M.A., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature; Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy; James Lorimer, M.A., Professor of Public Law; Archibald H. Charteris, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities; and William Ballantine Hodgson, LL.D., Professor of Political Economy.

In addition to these six, Professor Fleeming Jenkin ordered his name to be removed from the list of defenders, and a little later Professor Cosmo Innes did the same.

Though a majority of the Senatus did decide to defend the action, I believe that it was understood that such decision did not imply, on the part of all who acquiesced in it, any moral conviction that we were not entitled to obtain the desired declarator, since several other Professors appear to have agreed in feeling with the eight dissentients, but to have acquiesced in the defence of the action for the sake of having a formal legal decision given on one side or the other.

As the lawsuit against the University seems to me a matter of considerable importance, I have given in an Appendix such a summary of the facts, arguments, and judgments as space will allow. This summary was drawn up by me immediately after the trial, and was submitted to one of our counsel, to ensure its accuracy. The counsel on the other side were also asked to revise it, but declined to do so. I shall therefore in this

place give only such a bare outline of events as are essential to the completion of the history.

It was in March 1872 that the action of declarator was raised, and on July 26th the judgment of the Lord Ordinary (Gifford) was given substantially in our favour. The essence of this judgment lay in the following sentences :—

"The Lord Ordinary finds that, according to the existing constitution and regulations of the said University of Edinburgh, the pursuers are entitled to be admitted to the study of medicine in the said University, and that they are entitled to all the rights and privileges of lawful students in the said University, subject only to the conditions specified and contained in the said regulations of 12th November 1869 : Finds that the pursuers, on completing the prescribed studies, and on compliance with all the existing regulations of the University preliminary to degrees, are entitled to proceed to examination for degrees in manner prescribed by the regulations of the University of Edinburgh."

Had the University in truth desired only to do justice, their hands were now set free to do it. They had but to accept the decision of the Court, and to make the needful arrangements for carrying it out, as they could easily have done.

On the contrary, they appealed to the Inner House, and, after deliberations extending over nearly a year, judgment was, in June 1873, given against the ladies by seven of the Judges, while five decided in their favour. The whole expenses of both sides (amounting to £848, 6s. 8d.) were by this decision thrown on the lady students. It should be noticed that the Lord Justice-General gave no judgment (as he felt himself precluded from doing so, by his position as Chancellor of the

University), but that the Lord Justice-Clerk and the remaining Judges of the First Division all decided in favour of the ladies' claims. The adverse judgment of the majority was based mainly on the opinion that the University Court had, in 1869, done an illegal thing in admitting ladies to the University at all, and on this ground the authorities were held excused from all responsibility towards the ladies themselves. The Lord Justice-Clerk (who was himself Rector of the University in 1869, when the ladies were admitted) denies the justice of this view, and expresses himself on the point in terms which can hardly fail to commend themselves to the public good sense. In simple fact, the ladies lost their lawsuit, and with it all the labour and all the pecuniary outlay of the past four years, and also had thrown upon them the superadded burden of the expenses of both sides in this action, for the single offence of having trusted implicitly to the good faith and legal knowledge of the University of Edinburgh. They asked for admission to the University; that admission was granted by the concurrent action of all the authorities. It now appears that, instead of accepting the boon offered, and conforming themselves in every respect to the regulations laid down, they ought rather to have accused the University of ignorance of its own legal powers, and required security that, after receiving their fees for four years, the authorities would not repudiate all corresponding obligations. It is for the public to

judge how far such a course would have been more prudent and more commendable than that which they actually followed, and for which they have been so bitterly punished.

At any rate, the battle was over in Edinburgh for the time being. Perhaps some of us thought that "a noble defeat was better than a mean victory," but in any case the defeat had to be accepted, and the struggle carried on elsewhere. Where that future field was found, and how went the fortune of war, I hope to relate in the second part of this paper.

But it was by no means easy to decide in a moment what should be our next step. Very shortly after the decision of the Court of Session, a letter appeared in the *Times* from Dr. Garrett Anderson (formerly Miss Garrett) strongly urging that "the real solution of the difficulty will be found in Englishwomen seeking abroad that which is at present denied to them in their own country." I felt constrained to write to the same paper "to point out my reasons for thinking Dr. Garrett Anderson has selected the very worst of all the alternatives suggested," and urging that, on the contrary, the only true policy was *to fight it out on this line, i.e.* in our native country.[1] My reasons were,—(1) It was by no means certain that what we required might not yet be obtained at Edinburgh, or some other English, Scotch, or Irish University, even without the

[1] *Times*, August 5 and 23, 1873. Extracts from these letters are given in *Note EE.*

assistance of Parliament. (2) Measures were already in contemplation (of which I will speak subsequently) in the direction of legislation, either to enable Edinburgh to fulfil her engagements to us, or to solve the problem in other ways. (3) Even under existing conditions, it was by no means clear that we could not *demand* examination from some one or more of the Medical Examining Boards; and (4) it was at least certain that the problem of actual instruction had already been solved, as medical classes could still be obtained in the Edinburgh Extra-mural School; and, with some trouble, I believed they might also be organized in London or elsewhere. (5) Finally, it was beyond question that in the existing state of the law foreign education and foreign degrees had no legal value whatever, and, in my opinion, "few things would please our opponents better than to see one Englishwoman after another driven out of her own country to obtain medical education abroad, both because they know that on her return, after years of labour, she can claim no legal recognition whatever, and because they are equally certain that, so long as no means of education are provided at home, only a very small number of women will ever seek admission to the profession."

This last consideration was to me conclusive; and several of my fellow-students, especially Mrs. Thorne and Miss Pechey, agreed with me that we must find a way in which women could enter the medical profession in Great Britain, and in compliance with British law.

As that belief, with our consequent line of action, was much challenged at the time, it is no small pleasure to me to look back upon our obstinacy in adhering to it, and to refer for our justification to the logic of subsequent events.

It would of course have been possible for us to take our case by appeal into the House of Lords, and there seemed a fair chance (considering the diversity of opinion on the Scotch Bench) that we might have been successful in such appeal, as local influences would there be absent, and as the House of Lords is always credited with due attention to equity as well as law. But there were many reasons against this course. The expenses were already very large, and, liberal as our friends had shown themselves, it seemed a pity to waste money on doubtful proceedings of this nature, when it might be more fruitfully employed in laying solid foundations for medical study. Besides, no decision in our favour could give us the good-will of the Medical Faculty, and we knew only too well how impossible it was to secure fair play in the teeth of bitter animosity.[1]

[1] "We are inclined to congratulate Miss Jex-Blake and her friends on their misfortune yesterday. Had they succeeded, the judgment of the eight Lords . . . made it plain enough that they would only have got over the first of what might be an endless series of barriers. . . . To inform them that they could have their degree, if they could coax or outweary or outlive these four or five learned gentlemen, and were fortunate in seeing more facile persons succeed them, was surely to offer them a stone instead of bread. In fact the blind alley was interminable."

—*Glasgow Herald*, June 28, 1873.

The first point, then, was to ascertain whether any of the other Universities or Medical Schools would admit us, either in the ordinary way or on special conditions. There were two Universities—those of St. Andrews and of Durham—which gave medical degrees, and yet had no considerable medical school connected with them. In the case of St. Andrews, indeed, the Medical Faculty was only rudimentary, comprising but three Chairs, but for this very reason there were no medical students in regular attendance, and it seemed probable that arrangements could easily be made by which attendance on lectures in Edinburgh could be made "qualifying" to the necessary extent. I had an opportunity of ascertaining from a Minister, then in the Cabinet, that the Government would very gladly facilitate such arrangements; and indeed his remark to me was that if St. Andrews knew its own interests it would willingly accede to our request, as, if its Medical Faculty continued to lead a merely nominal existence, they might before long find themselves "improved off the face of the earth." We also had reason to believe that funds could be made forthcoming for the foundation of a fourth Medical Chair,—in fact I offered to make myself responsible for such foundation. We had several good friends among the Professors of St. Andrews (where, indeed, Miss Garrett had, I think in 1862, taken some classes), and we made our application for admission with fair hope of success. I believe that our point might have been gained, but for the

opposition of one of the medical Professors, who preferred a sinecure to the fatigues of professorial life; but ultimately our application was refused.

This refusal has always been to me a matter of regret, as I think the special position of St. Andrews, as a comparatively rural University, without male students of medicine, and yet with the power to grant degrees, fits it peculiarly to be the *Alma Mater* of the medical women of Scotland. I trust, indeed, that the matter may before long be once more reconsidered, and with a different result; especially as in 1883 the University became entitled (subject to a life interest) to a bequest of £30,000 from Sir William Taylour Thomson, K.C.M., G.C.B., "to found bursaries for students of both sexes in equal numbers, *and in the case of young women to assist them as far as practicable in qualifying themselves to enter the medical profession.*"[1] It is to be hoped that before this bequest becomes payable, the University will be in a position to comply with its conditions.

We applied also to the University of Durham, or rather, in the first instance, to the Newcastle Medical School, which is affiliated to it. Here also we found several good friends, and had for some time a hope that we should obtain admission. One main argument used against us was, that the lecturers feared that their few male students would still further diminish in number if women were allowed to attend the classes. We on

[1] *Daily News*, October 2, 1883.

our part offered to accept any conditions that might be made, either for mixed or separate classes, and also to guarantee any fees that might be required. Having ascertained that the average annual income of the Medical School was then about £700, we offered to make good any sum by which it might fall below that figure, for the first five years after our admission. Ultimately, however, in consequence of the strong opposition of one or two prominent medical men, the proposal had to be abandoned.

It seemed, therefore, impossible for the moment to make any arrangements for ultimate graduation, but it was quite within our power to obtain continuous medical instruction, in separate classes, in the Edinburgh Extra-mural School and in the Infirmary ; and we might hope that, under the special circumstances, our attendance on such classes would be accepted wherever we might eventually pass our Examinations.

During the winter of 1872–73, our never-failing friend, Dr. G. W. Balfour, had given us lectures on Practice of Medicine, and we had also had a course of Practical Anatomy with Dr. Hoggan (Dr. Handyside's late demonstrator), though unfortunately the latter class was technically "non-qualifying," because the University authorities, having learned *to whom* Dr. Hoggan wished to lecture, refused to "recognize" his lectures.

In the summer of 1873 we had a course of Medical Jurisprudence with Dr. Littlejohn ; and in the following winter we attended, in the Extra-mural School,

courses of Clinical Medicine, Midwifery, Materia Medica, and Pathology.[1] In the two last cases, the lecturers, knowing that it was useless to apply to the University of Edinburgh for the "recognition" necessary to make lectures valid, obtained that recognition from the University of St. Andrews. Our work at the Infirmary also went on as before both in the medical and surgical wards, thanks to the unfailing kindness of Dr. Watson and Dr. Balfour.

By the end of this winter session 1873–74, we senior students had taken all the classes available in Edinburgh, and had also had two years of Hospital instruction; so that, as graduation was hopeless, for the time at least, it was useless for us to remain longer, and, at the end of March 1874, the medical classes in Edinburgh were given up,—I will not say finally, but for the time being.

On March 2nd, 1874, was held the last great meeting of the Committee for Medical Education of Women in Edinburgh, to consider the position of affairs consequent on the decision of the Court of Session and the termination of our studies in Edinburgh. Professor Masson evidently carried the meeting with him when he characterized the state of things as "absurd and preposterous;" and additional interest was given to the proceedings by a speech from an Indian, who happened to be in Edinburgh at the time, and who knew something of the terrible need in India that co-existed with

[1] See *Note FF*.

the inveterate opposition at home. The Rev. Narayaa Sheshadri said that—

"When he listened to Professor Masson he could almost believe that we had not yet got out of the mediæval ages. He never thought that in the nineteenth century there could be any people who would throw obstacles in the way of female education, in this country at least. . . . He knew that lady doctors would be hailed in his country as a great blessing, for there were innumerable females whom no male doctor was allowed to see. He knew a doctor who was asked to prescribe for a Mahometan lady, and was only allowed to examine her tongue through a hole cut in her veil. . . . Among high caste ladies the symptoms of a disease had to be learned more from the description of some male relative than from the patients themselves."[1]

After the report of the Committee had been read and adopted, after excellent speeches by Professor Hodgson and others, it was moved by Dr. George Balfour, and unanimously agreed, that steps must now be taken to bring the whole matter before Parliament; and a Memorial was adopted by the meeting, and signed on its behalf by the chairman, Bailie Marshall, addressed to the Prime Minister, and representing—

"That a strong and increasing desire exists among women for the services of physicians of their own sex; and that, in the opinion of your Memorialists, there is every reason that such a desire should meet with sympathy and attention from a considerate Legislature.

"That the present monopoly of the medical profession by male

[1] About this time I had a talk with another Indian gentleman, who had studied medicine in this country, and I asked him what would be the usual procedure in the case of a young Indian lady who fell ill. His reply was,—"Well, the patient would tell the old woman of the family her symptoms; the old woman would repeat them to the old man of the family, and he in turn would tell them to the doctor; medical advice being returned through the same channels." How truly pleasant for both patient and doctor!

practitioners does not depend on any absence of demand for medical women, nor on any deficiency of female medical students, nor on any inability on their part to attain the ordinary professional standard of knowledge, but solely on artificial hindrances, which at present prevent women from taking a proper and equal position with men as duly-qualified medical practitioners. . . . That a real injustice is thus committed, both towards those women who desire to practise medicine, and towards those who wish to employ physicians of their own sex; and your Memorialists most respectfully beg you, as Head of Her Majesty's Government, to consider the facts as above stated, and as substantiated at greater length by the accompanying printed documents, and to devise with all convenient speed such remedy as to your wisdom may seem proper."

And thus, by and with the hearty good-will and concurrence of our invaluable friends in Edinburgh (whose interest indeed was often most kindly manifested subsequently), was initiated the next step in the drama that I have to relate.

Before, however, winding up this paper, with its history of the Edinburgh battle, I feel bound to put on record, as briefly as may be, what I believe to be the truth of the whole matter. I wish distinctly to protest against the idea that either the University education of women, or still more the question of mixed classes, has here been brought to any real or adequate test. So far is this from being in my opinion the case, that nothing has occurred to shake my conviction that, if when we first applied for admission in Edinburgh, we had simply been given the ordinary tickets, and if either no notice had been taken of our entrance as anything exceptional, or if the other students had been invited, as they were by Dr. Alleyne Nicholson, to join in welcoming us to their midst, no

difficulties would ever have arisen at all; or at least no difficulties but might have been most easily smoothed away by any manly teacher with a real reverence for his subject, and a belief in the profound purity of science.[1] I am sure that in theory it is both possible and right for ladies and gentlemen to study in the same classes any and every subject which they need to learn, and I have very little doubt that this will ultimately be the usual arrangement as civilization advances. But I am equally certain that boys of a low social class, of small mental calibre, and no moral

[1] "I am bold enough to say that there is nothing in the art of healing which may not fitly be spoken of before an audience of both sexes, provided there be a generally good tone prevailing among them, and the lecturer be of a pure and manly spirit. Indeed, I will go further, and say that his example in treating subjects of the kind incidental to his work with equal purity and courage, will be far from the least valuable part of his teaching. It will bring home to the hearts of his hearers, with more force than any other argument, the truth that every creature, every ordinance of God, is good and pure."—*Medical Women*, by Rev. Thomas Markby. London: Harrison.

Compare with the above the following statement made by an Edinburgh medical student in the columns of the *Scotsman*:—"I beg leave to relate what I myself listened to in a lecture-room of the University during the last summer session. On the occasion to which I refer, the Professor went a long way beyond the requirements of scientific teaching—into the regions of "spicy" but indelicate narrative—in order that he might appropriately introduce remarks to the following effect:—'There, gentlemen, I have minutely described to you those interesting incidents which it would have been impossible for me to notice if women were present; and I hope that we may be long spared the annoyance which their presence here would inflict upon us.' The tempest of applause that followed showed only too well the harmony which existed between teacher and pupils on points that would have been far better left unnoticed."—*Scotsman*, December 26, 1870.

training, are utterly unfit to be admitted to a mixed class, and I confess that I was most painfully surprised in Edinburgh to find how large a number there are of medical students who come under this description. I had honestly supposed, as I wrote seventeen years ago, that ladies need fear no discomfort in an ordinary medical class, as "the majority of the students *would always be gentlemen*." I regret that on this point I have been compelled somewhat to modify my opinion, though I would fain hope that the circumstances which obliged me to do so were to a great extent exceptional and local.[1] Nor do I think it possible that a mixed class can be satisfactorily conducted by any man who is not capable of inspiring his students with a reverence for purity, or who does not naturally teach them, alike by example and precept, that the fear of competition is essentially low and mean, and that the acme of degradation is reached when strength of any kind is used for the injury or annoyance of the weaker or less protected; and this being so, I acquiesce very heartily in the decision that, at present, *wherever Professors and students think it necessary*, women shall be taught medicine only in separate classes, though I hope, even in my lifetime, to see the day when such regulations are no longer required, because students and teachers

[1] "The truth is, a class of young men, inferior socially to their predecessors of ten years ago, now resort to the Edinburgh School, which has lost much of its attractiveness now that London and other seats of learning are so well appointed and so efficiently worked."

—*Lancet*, February 17, 1872.

alike have risen to a higher moral level.[1] In the meantime, let women but be granted permission to acquire their knowledge in any way that may seem best to their teachers, and that does not entail prohibitive expense, and I can assure the authorities that they will be well content. No one could desire to repeat the experiences of 1870–71.

As a matter of fact, when we applied for admission to Edinburgh University, there were some two or three Professors who were thoroughly resolved that we *should not* succeed. They tried at first to exclude us altogether, but when they found this a difficult matter, they professed to drop their objections, and to be willing to give us a fair trial. In real truth they did not believe that there was any chance of our doing the required work successfully, and they wished to be able to say that we had had every opportunity given to us, and had failed. But it was awkward for them that we did not fail, and the first really strenuous opposition occurred after Miss Pechey won the Hope Scholarship. When the students (who till then had behaved perfectly well to us) found that it was consistent with their Professors' notions of honour that a successful candidate should be deprived of her prize if she happened to be a woman, they naturally began to think themselves in some way wronged if women were allowed to compete with

[1] "*Mundis omnia munda!* Neither ladies nor lecturers are conscious of 'indelicacy' or 'breach of decorum.' Can it be that the unruly students are 'nice' only upon Dean Swift's principle, because they are 'nasty'?"—*Globe*, December 10, 1870.

them.[1] Again, in the mixed classes at Minto House and Surgeons' Hall, we found the students quite quiet and well-behaved, until they were deliberately roused to riot by those who ought to have shown them a better example. It was proved over and over again that a manly lecturer, who taught science as it should be taught, had no difficulty whatever in teaching students of both sexes at the same time, and in fact that it was only when a difficulty was *suggested* to the students that any was experienced.

I hope I have already made it clear that, even as things were, a considerable number of students were too manly to follow the evil example set to them, and I am glad to refer to a thoroughly chivalrous article, written I suppose by a student, and published in the

[1] The more manly students were, however, as indignant as any one at this idea, and I happen to know that the following capital letter was written by a gentleman then studying medicine in the University:—"Sir, —The course adopted by Dr. Phin when the question of admitting women to the medical classes was mooted, is now amply vindicated. Only great minds can fully understand what has not yet happened, but we now, all of us, feel the truth of his predictions. 'Women,' he said, 'would snatch the bread from the mouths of poor practitioners.' Already they *have* snatched a *Hope Scholarship* from us, or rather would have done so had it not been for the providence of the Senatus, who have defended us in weakness from the attacks of the weaker sex. So far, Mr. Editor, we are safe; but in the future, how shall we be able, unassisted and defenceless, to cope with the over-mastering sex in the open field of practice? Let our champion Dr. Phin again come to the rescue and save us—unable to save ourselves—lest similar scholarships and greater honours be snatched from us; and let the Senatus be on their guard, and on any future occasion again secure the emoluments to us, and leave the medals to the ladies.—I am, etc., K. V. C."

—*Scotsman*, March 31, 1870.

Edinburgh University Magazine,[1] on the other side of the question, and various indignant letters in the newspapers bore witness to feeling of the same kind.

An equally manly protest appeared about the same time in the *Oxford Undergraduates' Journal*,[2] which pointed out with inconveniently clear-sighted logic that "if it be unwomanly for a woman to study

[1] "To scream Indecency is not to argue, far less when such a demonstration is the death-throe of an iniquitous monopoly; and the shrieks of despair which the public has recently heard from certain reactionary practitioners betoken only a desire to protect family interests at the expense of half mankind. . . . The roars of derisive laughter with which [some students] greeted the allusion to their 'delicacy' . . . bear unequivocal testimony to this point from their own side, whilst those who have indulged in the pastime of pelting ladies with street filth after dark, can hardly have had the moral education of a scavenger. . . . To be accused of delicacy may be intensely comical, and to shout coarse remarks at ladies is perhaps exquisite wit; the chivalry of the gutter may have refinements of its own, and systematic insolence its charms, but with those whom feeling and education have led to think and act in accordance with this view of life the world can take but one course. It declares that for them no social degradation is too deep, no contempt too bitter. . . . Let us hear no more about indecency from the opponents of mixed instruction. The indecency is not in the subject, nor in the circumstances; it lies in the mind that is impure, and it is a slur upon the fame of our time-honoured *Alma Mater* to assert that Edinburgh men are morally incapable of studying medicine with women."

—*Edinburgh University Magazine*, March 1871.

[2] "There is no want of delicacy in women wishing to study these subjects along with us; there is gross indelicacy in our thinking there can be any indelicacy in their doing so. The only real objection to it is in the state of our own minds. Professors will have to give up amusing their students by improper stories; students will have to give up thinking there is anything amusing in indelicate stories and allusions. When this is done,—when men have become more manly, both in the Professor's chair and on the student's bench,—we shall hear no more of this objection to promiscuous teaching."—*Oxford Undergraduates' Journal*, Dec. 1870.

medicine with a man, how much more must it be so for her to be medically examined by a man when she is ill."

I think, by the bye, our opponents lost sight entirely of the effect of such conduct as theirs on the minds of women who could look a little beyond their own personal comfort and convenience. We had begun to study simply because we saw no reason why women should not be the medical attendants of women. When we came in contact with such unexpected depths of moral grossness and brutality, we had burnt into our minds the strongest possible conviction that if such things were possible in the medical profession, women *must*, at any cost, force their way into it, for the sake of their sisters, who might otherwise be left at the mercy of such human brutes as these.[1] As one very distinguished doctor said to me in Edinburgh, "It

[1] "What can remain for us to suffer which will exceed what has already gone before? For the sake of a cause that we hold sacred, we have endured such speeches as those levelled against us last year by two of the medical Professors. . . . For the sake of the women who long for the medical services of their own sex, we have borne to be pelted with street mud, and with far fouler names, by the 'perfect gentlemen' who desire to keep in their own hands exclusively the medical care of all women; we have submitted to have the ordinary labours of students doubled in our case by the wearing anxiety of uncertainty, and the stern necessity of imploring from one teacher after another the bare 'leave to toil' that came to others without effort; we have been harassed by arbitrary prohibitions at the very last moments preceding examinations, and finally forced to obtain legal advice before the most elementary rights granted to us by the regulations of two years ago could be secured at the present moment."—Letter from myself in *Scotsman*, October 31, 1871. See also *Note W.*

seems that gentlemen are ceasing to enter the medical profession; it is quite time that a few ladies should come in."

To proceed with my retrospect. We were singularly unfortunate in the changes that occurred in the Medical Faculty soon after our admission. Sir James Simpson, who had always been a warm friend to the women, died in the spring of 1870, and Professor Allman also resigned, both these Chairs being filled subsequently in a way adverse to our interests. After a year or two, Professor Hughes Bennett was the only really strong friend we had among the medical Professors, while our opponents increased both in number and in animosity. Sir Robert Christison, our chief opponent, was a man of great social and professional influence, and when once he set his whole will to work to crush us out of the University, we practically had little chance against him, especially as our case was almost always judged and decided in the presence of our foes, and in our absence.

But even after the Professors had refused, with almost complete unanimity, to lecture to us, either personally or by their assistants, the problem might still have been solved by means of the Extra-mural School, in which we were to the last always able to obtain excellent instruction. But any concessions in this direction met with even more unrelenting opposition from the Medical Faculty, for here came in what was popularly called at the time "the breeches-pocket argument."

Up to the middle of the present century, the University Professors had had an absolute monopoly of instruction, as no student could graduate who had not taken every class within the College walls, even when such class was useless for his purpose.[1] I wish that I could give the whole narrative at length, but the main facts were that in 1842 the Town Council ordained that *four* extra-mural classes should be allowed to count for graduation, — the said classes to be chosen by each student at his discretion. The Medical Faculty refused to consent, except on the iniquitous condition that any student taking such classes "should have a year added to his curriculum," *i.e.* be forced to spend his money in one way if not in another. The Town Council refused this condition, and insisted on the change proposed. The Senatus backed up the Medical Faculty, and actually went to law with the Town Council (then the recognized patrons of the University) rather than give up the Professors' monopoly even to this extent. In 1850 judgment was given against the Senatus; they appealed to the Inner House, but this judgment was confirmed in 1852. Again an appeal was taken to the House of Lords, but again in 1854

[1] Sir Alexander Grant relates that the matter was first brought up in 1840 by Professor Syme, who begged the Town Council to order the recognition of extra-mural classes; and "it was an argument for the change that one of the Professors . . . was so comparatively inefficient, that many students, after paying him his fee and obtaining his certificate of attendance, went to learn his subject elsewhere."—*Story of the University of Edinburgh.* Longmans, 1884. See also Sheriff Nicolson's *Memoirs of Adam Black* for a narrative of the same struggle.

the Town Council gained the day, and in 1855 the abhorred regulations came into operation, and have ever since remained in force. The principle, therefore, was established, that extra-mural instruction on any subject was equivalent to that given by the Professor within the walls; and many thorough-going free-traders have thought that the practical application should not be limited to four classes only. At the time that our question came to a dead-lock, I believe that a majority of the University Professors would have been glad to solve the problem by allowing us to take outside all the classes that we could not get inside the University; but I was warned that this would never be sanctioned, for the simple reason that it would give too dangerous a precedent.[1] If women could graduate successfully after taking most of their classes outside, why not men? and if men, what then became of the monopoly? The risk was too great, and so the last door of hope was shut upon us.

One word in conclusion. Whenever women are next

[1] Curiously enough, as these pages are passing through the press, I find evidence in favour of this view in a memorial referring to the "Universities (Scotland) Bill," sent up by the General Council of the University of Glasgow to the Secretary of State for Scotland.—"The members of the Senatus have private interests in common, which tend continually to clash with the general interests of the University. Thus, under the present management, any such extension of open teaching, whether intra-mural or extra-mural, as is demanded by the needs of the time and the progress of science, is not to be looked for, since it affects pecuniary interests. . . . On the perfect disinterestedness of the governing body must depend the effect of any ordinance . . . to break down the existing monopoly."—*Glasgow Herald*, March 10, 1886.

admitted to study in a British University,—and that day cannot be far distant,—it must be distinctly understood that they stand on the same footing as other students as regards their right to instruction. I would leave the Professors the option of giving that instruction in separate classes if they chose to do so; and then it would be known what the objections to mixed classes are really worth in the Professors' minds, and how many men are willing to sacrifice their own time and convenience to avoid them. But it should no longer be open to individual Professors to sacrifice, not their own convenience, but the whole professional future of those matriculated students who happen to be women. State Universities are subsidized from public funds contributed by taxpayers of both sexes, and I have yet to learn that any moral law, except "la loi du plus fort," justifies their exclusive monopoly by students of one sex only.[1] We can see plainly enough why it is (in the lowest sense) the interest of medical men to exclude women from their profession,—though, thank God, there are hundreds of medical men who would scorn to put their interests in one scale when justice weighed down the other,—but it is *not* the interest of the public or of the nation to sanction any such monopoly;—it is their interest to throw open the gates of competition as widely as possible, insisting

[1] "It is open to the objection that it would leave all persons, including women, taxed for the maintenance of Universities, confined exclusively to giving to men an education which women are to obtain only by expatriation."—*Scotsman*, September 4, 1873.

only on a uniform standard of attainment for all, of either sex, who would enter them; for by thus increasing the supply of really competent doctors, they give themselves the best possible opportunities of selection; and, as I have pointed out elsewhere, they double the chances of growth and advance in the fields of medical science.[1]

When this momentous question again comes before Parliament, I trust that the issues involved will be fully realized; and that, while providing for the most stringent examination of every candidate, no arbitrary barrier will be allowed to stand in the way of any, and no regulations permitted in national Universities which militate against the good old English motto for all,—a Fair Field and no Favour!

[1] "The wrong done to individuals by denying them the training necessary to the pursuit of a branch of knowledge, and the practice of an art for which they may have a special taste and capacity, is very great; but it involves a wrong not less signal to society, in limiting the sources whence good may come to it."—*Daily News*, November 1, 1871.

MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

II. THE VICTORY WON.

"For if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God."—Acts v. 39.

"It was necessary to appeal to a yet higher tribunal. Such appeal might have been made on the question of law to the House of Lords; but that would have meant further indefinite delay and further heavy expense, and then, if the result were favourable, a probable refusal of the University to act on their ascertained powers. It was necessary to *secure* the admission of women to medical study and practice, and not merely to ascertain that one out of nineteen examining bodies could admit them if it liked. Miss Jex-Blake and her friends determined to widen their appeal, to base it on the ground of right, and to address it to Parliament and to public opinion. It has taken four years to complete the justification of that policy, but it is now complete." Thus wrote in 1877 our invaluable friend, Mr. Stansfeld, and to his thoroughly chivalrous paper[1] I beg to refer any one

[1] "*Medical Women*," by the Right Hon. James Stansfeld, M.P., *Nineteenth Century Review*, July 1877.

who may wish to read the history of this movement, as it appeared to one who had no interest at stake on either side, except the one paramount interest of a love of justice and right. "The case," he says, "is an instance, not uncommon in the history of movements destined to succeed, of an up-hill struggle, apparently against long odds, of doubtful progress, hopes disappointed or defeated, the patience and the courage of many trembling in the balance, and then, at the moment of the greatest discouragement, the hour before the dawn, of a sudden collapse of opposition, and then of daylight and the haven reached."

As briefly and clearly as I can, I hope now to trace out the history of which the above sentence gives a graphic outline.

The question of the Medical Education of Women was brought under the notice of Parliament for the first time on August 3rd, 1872, when, in the debate on the Civil Service Estimates, Sir David Wedderburn (on behalf of Sir Robert Anstruther) moved that the vote for the Scottish Universities should be reduced by the amount of the salaries of the Edinburgh Medical Professors. He explained that the motion was brought forward in order to lay before the House the inexcusable conduct of the Medical Faculty; but that, as within the previous day or two a judgment in favour of the ladies had been given by the Lord Ordinary, he should venture to rely on the future action of the University, and should not press

the motion to a division. Mr. M'Laren, member for Edinburgh, characterized the conduct of the Professors in scathing terms, and said that if the Senatus now failed to give effect to the judgment of the Lord Ordinary, he for one should cordially vote for a similar motion in the following year.

It will be remembered that the University appealed against the judgment just referred to, and got it reversed on appeal by a bare majority, in June 1873. On July 29th, 1873, Sir David Wedderburn gave notice that he would, early in the following session, bring in a Bill to grant to the Scottish Universities the powers they were now supposed not to possess, to educate women in medicine, and to grant to them the ordinary medical degrees.

At the beginning of January 1874, I went to London to ascertain what help could be expected from the Government, and was glad to find, from interviews with several members of the Cabinet, that considerable interest and sympathy was felt in high quarters. Mr. Lowe, at that time Home Secretary, expressed his willingness to bring in a Bill on our behalf, if other members of the Cabinet were willing that he should do so, and I believe that this would have been done but for the sudden change of Government, which occurred within a few days of the Cabinet meeting at which the question was first brought forward and favourably considered. I may mention that Mr. Lowe's very friendly attitude was

due not only to his strong personal sympathy with freedom of education, but to the fact that, as M.P. for the University of London, he received about this time the following very remarkable memorial, signed by no less than 471 graduates of the University (*i.e.* about one-third of the whole number) :—

"Sir,—We, the undersigned Graduates of the University of London, and your Constituents, beg most respectfully to draw your attention to what we understand to be the present state of law concerning the admission of women to graduation in the various Universities in the United Kingdom, but more especially as regards their admission to graduation in the University of London. It appears that the Senate of the University of London finds it impossible, under the existing charters, to grant degrees to women, and that, however anxious it may be to confer this distinction upon all, without regard to sex, who shall comply with the regulations and be found fit for it by examination, it possesses the power of granting its degrees to men only.

"As a consequence of this, the benefits of the University are limited to less than one-half of the community. At the present time, although there are many persons who, by their literary and scientific attainments, are fully competent to take a degree, yet, for no other reason than that they are of the female sex, these persons are excluded from graduating in any University in the United Kingdom.

"Your Memorialists beg most emphatically to express their opinion that, as regards the University of London, such an unjust limitation should no longer be allowed to exist, that its degrees should be given as rewards for merit, and for merit alone, without regard to sex.

"Your Memorialists further believe that nothing will tend more to the future advancement of the higher education of women, than the knowledge that their attainments will meet with the reward of a University degree.

"Your Memorialists therefore pray that you will find it convenient to introduce into Parliament, in the forthcoming session, a measure which will enable the Senates of the several Universities of the United Kingdom to grant their degrees to women, should they find it expedient so to do."

It is very pleasant to record that this noble protest was due in great part to the indefatigable exertions

of a medical man, Dr. Alfred Shewen, indignant at the attitude of the majority of his profession, and that it received the signatures of no less than sixty other medical graduates, including among them Dr. Samuel Wilks, Sir Henry Thompson, Mr. Berkeley Hill, Mr. Edmund Owen, Dr. Routh, and many other honoured names.[1] Of the subsequent action of the University of London I shall have more to say in a future page.

Meanwhile the change of Government and dissolution of Parliament were fatal to our hopes of immediate success; not because one political party was more likely to help us than the other (for we always found excellent friends and bitter foes in both camps), but because all legislation was of course suspended for the moment, and new measures had to be initiated in a new Parliament.

Very soon after the commencement of the session, however, a Bill was announced, and (Sir David Wedderburn not having sought re-election) it was brought in by friends representing both political parties, viz. by the Right Hon. W. Cowper-Temple, the Right Hon. Russell Gurney, Mr. Orr Ewing, and Dr. Cameron. It was entitled "*A Bill to Remove Doubts as to the Powers of the Universities of Scotland to admit Women as Students, and to grant Degrees to Women.*"

If this Bill had become law it would merely have

[1] See *Note T.*

enabled all the Scottish Universities to act as might seem to each most proper in this matter. In spite, however, of the merely permissive character of the Bill, the University Court of Edinburgh (at a meeting at which five out of its eight members were present) saw fit to petition against it, on the ground of the great "division of opinion" existing on the subject. It is sufficiently difficult to see why they should thus seek to deny to other Universities the liberty of action which, in their own case, was in no way endangered.

A petition against the Bill was also presented in the name of the Senatus of Edinburgh University, but only *twelve* out of the (then) thirty-seven members of the Senatus were consenting parties to the petition, as it was agreed on at a meeting held after the close of the session, when most of the non-medical Professors were out of town. A separate petition was also presented by certain members of the Medical Faculty, who were, in fact, the same men who had already petitioned as members of the Senatus. The only other petition presented against the Bill was one from the University of Glasgow, and the arguments adduced in this case were chiefly directed against the granting any increase of power to the University Court as such.

On the other hand, a memorial in favour of the policy advocated in this Bill was forwarded to the Prime Minister from twenty-six Professors of Scotch Universities, including *eight* (out of *fourteen*) Pro-

fessors of the University of St. Andrews, one of whom was the Senior Principal of that University; and also including *thirteen* Professors of the University of Edinburgh. A petition to the same effect was also presented to Parliament by all those Medical Lecturers of the Extra-mural School of Edinburgh who have themselves had practical experience in teaching the lady students.[1]

A similar petition was also presented by the Committee for Securing a Complete Medical Education to Women in Edinburgh, which now numbered more than a thousand persons, resident in all parts of the kingdom. The Town Council of Edinburgh (which until 1858 possessed absolute control over the University) also petitioned Parliament in favour of the Bill; as also the Town Council of Aberdeen and the Town Council of Linlithgow. A petition in favour of granting facilities for the medical education of women was also signed by more than 16,000 women, and presented to the House of Commons. In a very short time no less than *sixty-five* petitions in favour of the Bill were presented to Parliament, the one from the City of Edinburgh alone comprising more than 4000 signatures.

Respecting the hostile petitions from Edinburgh University, Mr. Cowper-Temple forcibly remarked, in the course of the subsequent debate, that—

"The petition which was presented by the Senatus of the University

[1] See *Note GG.*

of Edinburgh showed certainly a good deal of difficulty in finding reasons for objecting to such an alteration or amendment of the law. Most corporations, as well as individuals, were not averse to having additional powers given to them, particularly powers which they previously believed they had, and which they had proceeded to exercise. Persons who were conscious of rectitude of intention and a desire to do good, were anxious to have as much authority given to them as they thought they could turn to a useful account; but the Senatus of the Edinburgh University objected to an increase of their powers. He should have thought that to high-minded men it would have been a relief to feel that the Legislature would take them out of the false position of having inflicted an injustice, and would relieve them from the charge of breaking faith with those students who had entered their college on the understanding that they were to be allowed to complete their education, and become eligible for degrees."

Such, however, were apparently not the views of the ruling powers in the University of Edinburgh.

The second reading of the Bill had been fixed for April 24th, 1874, and the subject could then have been thoroughly discussed, but, at the urgent request of Dr. Lyon Playfair, the member for the University of Edinburgh (who pleaded for "*time to consider*" a question that had been before the University for at least three years) it was postponed to a later date, when the pressure of business made it impossible to secure any day for the second reading, and a mere Notice of Motion was all that could be brought before the House; the whole question being thus practically shelved for another year.

I must, however, say a few words about the very important debate that occurred on this motion on June 12th, 1874, as this was the first occasion when the question was really in any adequate way submitted to Parliament; and though, in consequence of

the forms of the House, no vote was taken, the publicity given to the subject was of the utmost value. Mr. M'Laren, M.P. for Edinburgh, bore emphatic witness that as regarded the education of women at the University, "there was in fact no difficulty but want of will, and that arose from medical prejudice;—at least, that was the opinion of the great majority of the people of Edinburgh. The city had no sympathy with the bigotry manifested by a small section of the Professors. If this were a question to be decided by the intelligent inhabitants of Edinburgh, nine-tenths of them would vote in its favour."[1]

Mr. Stansfeld made an admirable speech in favour of throwing open all employments to women, and remarked, only too shrewdly, that those who seemed so much afraid of the admission of women into the medical profession, had apparently very little faith in their own prophecies as to the unfitness of women for medical practice. Mr. Henley also, the "father of the House," spoke in favour of the motion; and Mr. Cowper-Temple, in the course of his excellent statement of the case, remarked that—

"In cases of alterations or innovations proposed to be made in professions,—whether military, naval, or legal,—the public could not submit to professional opinion. The members of a profession were often unable to consider, without bias, innovations relating to themselves, and, much as he respected the medical profession, he would still say that Parliament ought not to give undue attention to objections which they might raise in

[1] *Scotsman*, June 13, 1874.

matters relating particularly to their own profession. Let them rather look to the needs and desires of the public at large. A large portion of the public were really desirous that properly qualified women should be able to practise medicine ; and yet if women desired at present to obtain degrees, they must go to France or to America,—anywhere rather than to their own land,—because England was the only one of the chief countries in Europe where it was impossible for them to obtain degrees."

Sir Francis Goldsmid also spoke in favour of the medical education of women, and said that he should have considered it an honour to University College, London, if they had been admitted there.

With the failure of the Bill above referred to we lost the last hope of a favourable turn of affairs in Scotland, at least for the present. It became, therefore, a matter of pressing necessity that arrangements should be made for medical classes elsewhere, and in August 1874 I came to London to see what could be accomplished there. The first idea of course was to obtain admission, if possible, to some of the existing schools, of which there were no less than eleven in London, some of them with a very small attendance of students. I soon found, however, that this was hopeless, as, though in almost every school we had one or more friends, we found also in each a majority of foes. It was to Mr. A. T. Norton, of St. Mary's Hospital, that the credit was due of suggesting that a thoroughly good school might be organized, apart from the existing schools, but with friendly lecturers gathered from any or all of them. I at once saw the value of this proposal, which would avoid all difficulty respecting the "recognition" of

new lecturers, and set myself without delay to attempt to carry it out.

We had many kind friends in London, both in and out of the medical profession, but I feel bound to say here that the foundation of the London School of Medicine for Women was made possible by the help and sympathy of three men above all others,—Dr. King Chambers, Dr. Anstie, and Mr. Norton. The work was difficult enough in any case, but without their generous co-operation, and the sanction given by their professional and social influence, it would have been impossible. I, for one, shall never forget what we English medical women owe to the two who are still with us, and to the one who passed away almost at the moment that the success of our school was secured.

Dr. Anstie was himself an embodiment of the spirit of chivalry, and his indignation had been roused to the highest degree by the treatment that we had received. "I wonder," he said to me, "that the public do not rise against the medical profession and stone us with paving-stones!" He agreed to my urgent request that he should himself be Dean of the proposed school, as Dr. Chambers could not undertake so heavy a task, and threw himself into the task of organization with indomitable energy. In a very few days we had obtained sufficient promises of assistance to make success almost a certainty, had opened a temporary office in Wimpole Street, and had made all

arrangements for an initial meeting at Dr. Anstie's house. I knew that Dr. Garrett Anderson still thought that it would be better for women to go abroad to study, and believed that "the time for the creation of a good school for women had not yet come;" but, now that our prospects were so promising, I begged her to join the Committee which we were about to form, and, after some hesitation, she kindly agreed to do so, as did also Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell.

The preliminary meeting was held on August 22nd, 1874, and at it were present, Dr. Anstie, Dr. Garrett Anderson, Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Burdon-Sanderson, Dr. Chambers, Dr. Cheadle, Mr. Critchett, Mr. Norton, Dr. Sturges, Miss Pechey, and myself. It was agreed that a Provisional Council should be formed of registered medical practitioners only, and to the names of those present at the meeting were soon added those of Dr. Blackwell, Dr. Billing, Mr. Berkeley Hill, Dr. Hughlings Jackson, Dr. Payne, Professor Huxley, Dr. Sturges, and others. Not being a registered practitioner, I could not be a member of this Council, but I undertook the secretarial work connected with the proposed organization, though without any official position, until Dr. Chambers, Mr. Norton, Mrs. Thorne, and I became trustees of the School shortly afterwards.[1]

So rapidly was the work pushed forward, that our staff of lecturers was almost organized before we

[1] See *Note HH.*

had succeeded in finding any local habitation for the School. After, however, an almost incredible amount of search, enquiry, and disappointment, I succeeded in finding wonderfully suitable premises, in the shape of a very old-fashioned house in Henrietta Street, Brunswick Square, with spacious ground-floor rooms, and long frontage to a walled garden of a size very unusual in the centre of London. On the upper floor were a series of rooms suitable for museums, library, reading-room, etc.[1] I got a lease of the house in September, in conjunction with Mr. Norton, and on October 12th, 1874, the School was actually opened.

In the meantime a terrible calamity had befallen us, in the sudden death of our invaluable friend Dr. Anstie on September 12th, and for a moment it seemed as if his loss might be absolutely fatal to our hopes; but his work had been done too thoroughly for subsequent failure, and all that he had toiled and planned

[1] "For the early existence of an institution like this School of Medicine no more appropriate home could in all probability be found within the wide area of London than the curious old house in Henrietta Street. In a central position, within easy reach of museums and libraries, but retired from the bustle of noisy thoroughfares, a range of spacious rooms stretches a long front towards the green sward of an old-fashioned garden. Apartments admirably adapted for the purpose of lecture halls 'give,' as the Americans say, from underneath a broad verandah on this pleasant outlook. Cosy in winter, cool in summer, and undisturbed by the sounds of external life always, these rooms should be highly favourable to philosophic contemplation. In the upper storey—there is only one above the ground-floor—are several smaller apartments suitable for museums and reading-rooms."—*Daily News*, March 13, 1877.

for was carried out, the deanship being now accepted by our equally stanch friend, Mr. A. T. Norton.

Twenty-three students joined the School during its first year, and the work was begun on the principle of a rotation of classes ; courses of Anatomy, Physiology, and Chemistry being given during the first winter session ; and, in the summer, Practical Chemistry, Materia Medica, Botany, and Zoology. To these was added a course on Mental Pathology, most generously given gratuitously by Dr. Sankey.

On May 3rd, 1875, the Provisional Council handed over the control of the institution it had so successfully initiated to a Governing Body, consisting of its own members and of a number of other influential friends and subscribers, from whom an Executive Council are chosen annually.

During the second year, 1875–76, six new students were admitted. The classes included Anatomy, Practical Anatomy, Physiology, Surgery, Practice of Medicine, Midwifery, Forensic Medicine, and Ophthalmic Surgery. During the winter session of 1876–77, courses of lectures on Pathology and Practice of Medicine were given, and a course of Practical Anatomy, with Demonstrations, was substituted for the courses of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery, which require access to a large general Hospital. The proposed three years' curriculum would therefore have been fully carried out, had it not been for this important exception. The classes of Zoology, Mental

Pathology, and Ophthalmic Surgery were not included in the curriculum required by most of the Examining Boards, and were in excess of their demands.

Very liberal support was given to the School in the way of financial help, which came, in the first instance, chiefly from friends already enlisted in our cause during the contest in Edinburgh,[1] and subsequently from many others who, through Dr. Garrett Anderson and other London friends, became interested in the School and its work. During the first three years, 1874–77, about £2000 was contributed in this way to meet an income of £1249 from students' fees, and an expenditure of about £3267.[2] No doubt the cost of the School was somewhat greater than that of most Medical Schools; but there were, of course, large expenses to incur in the first instance, and, under the special circumstances of the case, we thought it right to guarantee fixed fees to each lecturer, which is not usually done where the teaching staff are also the physicians and surgeons of a hospital connected with the School. I certainly can bear witness that in the course of those three years, during which everything passed more or less through my hands, we never lost sight of the need of the utmost possible economy; and, though the outlay seems large, I doubt whether any money was ever better or more usefully spent.

[1] Before the School was opened, Mrs. Thorne and I had succeeded in obtaining contributions of £100 each from fourteen friends.

[2] See *Note HH.*

Our friends helped us also most kindly in other ways. On June 2nd, 1875, the prizes for the winter session were distributed by the Right Hon. Earl of Shaftesbury, who said that the difficulties encompassing the movement "were really of value to the cause, and also served to strengthen the character and increase the energy of those who had to encounter them. His main basis of interest in the School was his belief in the inherent right of choice possessed by all persons as to their occupations. . . . If the ladies succeeded, they would add just so much intellect and power to the profession."[1] Mr. Critchett also testified his belief that "great progress in some departments of medicine might be made by the aid of women as medical practitioners." In the following year Lord Shaftesbury was again good enough to distribute the prizes, and on both occasions the great interest felt in the School was evidenced by the crowded audience of friends that filled up the great lecture-room, and overflowed into the verandah and passages. Lord Aberdare also kindly presided at the first meeting of the governing body.

But there was another side to the matter. In spite of all this kind interest and help, the School failed entirely during more than two years to secure two absolutely indispensable conditions of success :— (1) It could obtain no official "recognition" from any one of the nineteen Examining Boards, although its

[1] *Times*, June 3, 1875.

teachers, with I think two exceptions, were men already abundantly "recognized" elsewhere; and though the experience and care of the Dean, Mr. Norton, gave the best of guarantees that every ordinary regulation and requirement of medical schools was rigidly complied with. Letters were written to every one of the Examining Boards, asking for the needful recognition, but not one of the nineteen would comply with the urgent request. (2) It was during the first three winter sessions found absolutely impossible to secure "qualifying" hospital instruction. Every effort was made to obtain it, but in every quarter our efforts were defeated. Application was made to the London Hospital, where Miss Garrett had taken part of her time of study, and where it was well known that the number of beds was greatly in excess of the needs of the students in attendance.[1] We therefore petitioned that some small portion of the Hospital (100 beds would have been ample) might be given up to the women, and it was well known that the patients would have gained greatly by the arrangement, as the existing number of students was quite insufficient to provide the proper number of clinical clerks and dressers; but though many of the non-medical (and a few of the medical) authorities were warmly in favour of the

[1] The number of students was, I think, under a hundred, and the Hospital contained 600 beds,—about the same number which in the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh affords a field of study for nearly 2000 students.

concession, the obstructive element was too strong, and our request was refused. So also it was by the medical staff of the Royal Free Hospital, which was close to the School, and had no students at all. Efforts were even made to utilize the workhouse infirmaries for purposes of study, but here also practical difficulties were too great for us.

At the end of the second winter session there seemed hardly any hope of solution of these two tremendous difficulties,—either of which alone would have been fatal,—and yet in a few months, thanks to our never-failing friends, both problems were to be solved.

I must first recur to the very pressing necessity for Parliamentary legislation, in the absence of which no means whatever of "registration" (and therefore of legal practice) were open to our women students, however thoroughly they might fit themselves for the exercise of their profession. No one could be registered without examination; none of the Boards appointed for the purpose would examine any woman, and many of them protested their inability to do so. It was therefore abundantly clear that, in some form or other, legislation was an absolute necessity. "It was felt that the existence of the School would be in itself an appeal to the justice of Parliament. But the School could not continue to exist if the way to examination were long barred to women, who could only be expected to avail themselves of the instruc-

tion it afforded under two conditions—viz., 1st, that the instruction should suffice to entitle the students to examination, if Parliament should repudiate their supposed disability of sex; and 2nd, that Parliament should practically remove that disability. At the end of the session of 1875, the School had existed for one year; the course of study would be naturally one of three years, but nothing seemed then to point to a reasonable probability of legislation opening the way to the examining, licensing, and registration of medical women within a period of two more years."[1]

On March 3rd, 1875, the Enabling Bill of the previous session again came up for second reading, and a long debate ensued, the advocates and opponents of the measure being taken almost equally from both sides of the House. The second reading was urged by Mr. Cowper-Temple, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Stansfeld, and Mr Roebuck. Their arguments were mainly founded on (1) the justice of the claims of those ladies who had been already admitted to matriculate and study at a Scotch University, and had then been refused examination and graduation on the ground of illegality; (2) the desire that ought to be felt by the University of Edinburgh to be enabled to remedy so signal an injustice; (3) the desirability that women should have access to the highest education, and should be admitted to University examinations in general; (4) the special

[1] Right Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P., *Nineteenth Century*, July 1877.

demand that existed for women as medical practitioners, and the impossibility of their placing their names on the Medical Register without admission to some recognized examination for a licence or degree.

On the other side the speakers were Mr. Maitland, Sir Windham Anstruther, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Ernest Noel, Mr. Mark Stewart, Dr. Playfair, and the Lord Advocate (Mr. Gordon). Their arguments were mainly devoted to prove (1) that the Bill would be injurious to the interests of the Scotch Universities; (2) that the ladies in question had overstated their claims on the University of Edinburgh; (3) that women might be admitted to the Medical Profession by other means.

It was hardly seriously disputed that women were entitled to the highest education, nor (except by a single member) that medicine was a suitable profession for them. The Bill was, however, lost by 196 votes as against 153; but this vote, following as it did on a hostile speech from a member of the Government, must certainly be considered to show that the Bill had secured the attention of the House, and that a very large number of independent members felt its claims to be well founded.

The following passage from the speech of Mr. Roebuck, who has always been an opponent of the admission of women to the suffrage, is worth recording:—

"You may hide it as you like, you may cover it up in fine phrases if you please, but at the bottom the opposition to this Bill is a trades-union

opposition. It is seen by the medical profession that they will incur more competition, and that women will be their competitors, and therefore they oppose the Bill. But I would ask, what harm can possibly be done to any class of human beings by granting the power asked in this measure? What possible danger can arise from its becoming law? The answer must be that there can be none, and if this is so, how can you possibly refuse to pass it? (Hear, hear.) We are here a body of *men* deciding upon the interests of the community, and we ought not to forget that, in spite of ourselves, the feeling of our own sex rises up, and men's interests are preferred to women's interests, and, in spite of all the soothing words we hear, men will desire to do that for men which they will not do for women. You may talk for a month, you may bring great names and great learning to bear on the question, but you cannot rub out the stain that will be thrown upon this House if it now refuses to do justice to women, and prevents them from using the faculties which God has given them in a fair, upright, and honest manner for their own good, and with a view to their own livelihood."[1]

It used to be said in Edinburgh that we "never knew when we were beaten," and our Parliamentary friends certainly showed something of the same characteristic now. No sooner had the Scottish Enabling

[1] In a similar spirit are the following editorial remarks from a paper that has always opposed the extension of the suffrage to women :—

"The effect of the rejection of this Bill upon the question of women's suffrage is peculiarly to be regretted, at least by those who hold as we do, that, though the balance of theoretical arguments may be in favour of giving women that privilege, women would practically be better without it. . . . But much of what was said, and all that was done on Wednesday, are very apt to suggest that, though women often receive more (which is apt to prove worse) than justice, they are more than apt to receive less in any question where the rights of the female sex even appear to collide with the interests of any considerable number or powerful class of men. Can anybody believe that if women had been in possession of political votes, all that was said and done last Wednesday would have happened just as it did? Nay, can anybody capable of conceiving anything happening under other circumstances, doubt for a moment that the balance would have been thrown the other way?"—*Scotsman*, 8th March 1875.

Bill been rejected, than another Bill was introduced by Mr. Cowper-Temple, on March 22nd, 1875, to permit the registration of the degrees of the five specified foreign Universities of France, Berlin, Leipsig, Berne, and Zurich, whenever such degrees were held by women.

As all efforts to secure the admission of women to the ordinary examinations seemed doomed to failure, it seemed reasonable to propose that some medical degree or licence not granted by the ordinary Boards should be permitted to qualify for registration. Many of the most eminent European Universities had in past times granted degrees to women, and several of them were still distinguished by the same wise liberality. The University of France had recently granted a medical degree to an Englishwoman, and several of our countrywomen were studying in Paris with a view to the same diploma. As this University is second to none in Europe, it seemed reasonable that its degree and those of other similar Universities should be admitted as at least equivalent to the not very valuable licences granted, after not very strict examination, by certain of the British Examining Boards.

It may be remembered that the Medical Act of 1858 contained a clause expressly entitling to registration any persons who had already foreign degrees, and who were at the time in practice in England, and under this clause one woman was actually registered,

so that this Bill only proposed a measure for which an exact precedent already existed.

It was, however, found impossible to obtain the support of the Government to this measure, and consequently no day could be secured for a second reading of the Bill, and the matter was again deferred to another session.

Something, however, was done that year. On June 16th, 1875, in answer to a question of Mr. Stansfeld's on the Medical Act Amendment (College of Surgeons) Bill, Lord Sandon admitted, in the name of the Government, that the subject of the medical education of women, only very lately submitted to the attention of Government, demanded their consideration; and he undertook that it should be carefully considered by the Government during the recess, so that they should be enabled to express definite views with regard to legislation upon it in the next session. And this was the first step positively gained,—the admission by Government that the question was one upon which they were bound to come to an opinion, and the promise that they would do so effectively not later than the following session of 1876. In accordance with this undertaking, and in anticipation of it, a letter had been already addressed by Mr. Simon, in the name of the Lord President of the Privy Council, to the President of the General Medical Council, requesting the observations of the Medical Council on Mr. Cowper-Temple's

Bill for the Registration of Foreign Degrees; and the letter further stated that it appeared to the Lord President that the Bill could hardly fail to raise in Parliament the general question of the admission of women to the medical profession, and that his grace would therefore be glad that the Council should also discuss as fully as they might see fit this wider question.

A long and hotly contested debate ensued at the meeting of the General Medical Council, which was held in June 1875. The debate extended over three out of the six days allotted to the meeting of the Council, and ended in the adoption of a report, in reply to the Lord President, which conceded, however grudgingly, the main point, viz. that women *should not be excluded* from the medical profession.[1]

"The Medical Council are of opinion that the study and practice of medicine and surgery, instead of affording a field of exertion well fitted for women, do, on the contrary, present special difficulties which cannot be safely disregarded; *but the Council are not prepared to say that women ought to be excluded from the profession.*"

I wish very much it were in my power to give a detailed account of that debate, which is full of interest and significance. Mr. Turner and Dr. Andrew Wood upheld the reputation of the Edinburgh medical clique for bigotry and intolerance; the former actually being not ashamed, as an anatomist, to quote the worn-out old argument about the smaller size of women's brains, without allowing (as Professors

[1] See *Note II.*

Rolleston and Humphrey both pointed out) for the smaller size of their bodies, which happens to bring the relative proportions even.[1] He also proceeded to assure the Council that the excess of the emotional element and deficiency of the logical element in women's minds quite unfitted them for medical practice.

Dr. Andrew Wood drew harrowing pictures of the dissecting room and operating theatre, for which he received a dignified reproof from Professor Humphrey, who remarked that "enormous opportunities of doing good to our fellows" might compensate for a good many disagreeables; and that, as a matter of fact, he had never been present at an important operation without seeing women-nurses in attendance, and that therefore it failed to strike him as an enormity that women-students might be present also. As to the unfitness for practice of which Mr. Turner had spoken, he remarked, "I have often been surprised, nay, I might say put to shame, by the readiness of resource of women—by the courage of women—in some of the greater emergencies and more serious positions of life." Mr. Macnamara bore witness that the physical

[1] "Investigator clearly shows that if mere brain weight is a decisive criterion of mental power, our country has grievously sinned in not affording the highest kind of education to elephants and whales,—the two classes of animals that have the heaviest brains." "Professor Marshall is probably most accurate in saying that the percentage of brain weight to body weight is almost identical in the two sexes, and this is what most people would naturally expect if there were no theories to support on one side or the other."—See *Scotsman*, January 2 and 5, 1874.

and mental strength of thousands of women was more than adequate to the demands of medical practice, as had been repeatedly proved by the work done by nurses and sisters of charity. "It appears," he said, "that it is most becoming and proper for a woman to discharge all those duties which are incidental to our profession for thirty shillings a week; but if she is to have three or four guineas a day for discharging the same duties, then they are immoral and immodest, and unsuited to the soft nature that should characterize a lady."[1] Dr. Thomson maintained that it was "incontrovertible that attendance by females on females was more decent and appropriate than attendance by men, . . . and that there were a great number of cultivated and refined women who would prefer it. . . . They would be better attendants upon children in illness than men could be." Professor Rolleston put the whole question in a nut-shell;—"A large number of persons do wish for this thing—some women wish to be doctors, others wish to have women-doctors. This feeling is a growing one, and is in itself a reason."[2]

[1] Here is a delicious comment on the above theory: "Mr. Richard Davy, in his inaugural lecture at Westminster Hospital, threw out a brilliant idea with respect to the proper work for women. . . . He is grieved to see so much unpaid or poorly paid work done by medical men. . . . His idea is that the ladies, who are pressing into the profession, may remove a serious embarrassment by undertaking '*the work and dignities of unpaid appointments.*' Whether this neat solution of the question is a surgical joke to be appreciated only after an operation . . . we are at a loss to know."—*Daily News*, October 6, 1875.

[2] *Medical Press and Circular*, July 7 and 14, 1875.

On the whole, it was delightful to find the debate raised to such a much higher level than we had been accustomed to in medical circles, and though the final Report (as the result of a compromise) was not wholly satisfactory, it yet did mark a very great advance, as an expression of opinion from the highest medical authority in the country.

It was curious to remark that among the speakers who were more or less hostile to the women's claims, there was a very strong tendency to urge a *separate* examination and qualification for them, if any. It was the old story (with a difference) of certificates *versus* degrees, as proposed by the Edinburgh authorities; and at the bottom of it was plainly to be seen, here and on other occasions, the deep-rooted reluctance of a certain class of men to allow the possibility of mental equality with women.[1] If only the examinations and diplomas could be made *different*, there would be no possibility of bringing to an inconvenient test the loudly asserted inferiority which they were so unwilling to admit to proof. To us, on the other hand, the identity of standard was vital: we did not wish that women should go in by

[1] "We know a very distinguished graduate . . . who told us frankly what his motives are. 'I have,' said he, 'invested some hundreds of pounds in my education, and what I have to show for it is this degree of M.B.Ed. Had I known there would ever have been a chance of women taking this M.B., I should have gone somewhere else and got another which they could not take. . . . I have a personal objection to wearing a degree that is or may be worn by a woman.'"—*Scotsman*, Jan. 30, 1872.

a side-door, and take rank as inferior practitioners; we wished that the medical authorities should fix the standard of attainment for the medical profession, and let the women, with a fair field and no favour, stand or fall by their ability to attain it.[1]

It was undoubtedly in the same spirit that Mr. Simon made the suggestion soon afterwards, that we should apply to the College of Surgeons for its "Licence in Midwifery," which was a registrable qualification, though seldom taken alone by those who had a choice of various diplomas. We were not inclined to refuse any opportunity of registration, and therefore, on December 2nd, 1875, Mrs. Thorne, Miss Pechey, and I, made a formal application for admission to the examination for this diploma. No official reply was received for about five weeks, and in the interval the authorities of the College took the opinion of counsel as to their legal power to grant or refuse our application. They were advised "that the College had power to admit women under its supplemental charter, and *could be compelled by legal process* so to examine and grant certificates; . . . that the Medical Act clearly considered the holder of such certificate a licentiate in midwifery, and as such entitled to register."[2] As, then, the College had no option in the matter, the secretary requested us, on

[1] For a capital statement of the case, see a very able letter from Dr. Garrett Anderson in the *Times* of May 8, 1878, from which I give some extracts in *Note JJ*.

[2] *British Medical Journal*, January 15, 1876.

January 8th, 1876, to send in our certificates of attendance on the classes required before examination, and it should be noted that the College required the same certificates as if we had been admitted to examination for the membership of the College. In point of fact we sent in certificates considerably in excess of those demanded, as we had taken the full course required for the Edinburgh University degree.

On February 17th, 1876, our certificates were accepted as satisfactory, and on the motion, I think, of our firm friend, the distinguished oculist, Mr. Critchett, it was resolved by the Council of the College that we should be admitted to the examination in midwifery. This was duly intimated to us by the secretary, and on February 25th we were further informed "that in the case of those candidates who have presented themselves for the midwifery examination, and who have not possessed any qualification, *it has been the practice of the College*,[1] in addition to the ordinary examination by the Examiners in Midwifery, to submit them to a special examination by the Chairman of the Board in Anatomy and Surgery, particularly in relation to the subject of midwifery."

On March 17th we were further informed that we had been formally accepted by the College as candi-

[1] This admission is particularly edifying, in view of the pretence, subsequently set up, that the "strike" of the Examiners was due to the tenderness of their consciences, which did not allow them to admit "persons" to the Register by this licence alone, it being "never intended" except as an "additional qualification."—See *Lancet*, April 22, 1876.

dates for examination, and should have due notice of the next examination. I need not say that, for weeks both before and after this communication, we gave up our whole available time to preparation for the enlarged examination of which we now received this formal notice.

But there were wheels within wheels. If it suited certain members of the profession that we should be relegated to a side-door for admission to the Register, it was as offensive as possible to another section that this portal should be specially connected with the practice of midwifery, which Dr. Andrew Wood and others most loudly assured the public "was just the branch of practice for which women were *least* fitted."[1] The Obstetrical Society were at once in a flutter when the mere idea got wind, and, within a few days of our dreadful application, the medical papers solemnly informed the public that the "Obstetrical Society had determined to appoint a committee to watch the proposal to render women eligible to the licence in midwifery."[2] The watching committee evidently passed into a condition of grievous trepidation, and on February 18th they forwarded an urgent remonstrance to the College of Surgeons, that "persons so imperfectly qualified" (*i.e.* who had attended the full course for a University degree in Medicine, and who were willing to submit to any required examination)

[1] Debate at the General Medical Council, June 1875.
[2] *Lancet*, January 15, 1876.

must really not be admitted to the Register, for that such admission would be most "injurious to the interests of the public (!) and of the profession."[1]

However, this pathetic remonstrance, and others that followed it, were of no avail, and it was clear to the much-exercised mind of the Obstetrical Society that a *coup d'état* was the only means of salvation. As soon as it was publicly announced that the women were accepted for examination, and were indeed ready to undergo it, the thunderbolt fell in the shape of the resignation of Dr. Barnes, and subsequently of Dr. Farre and Dr. Priestley, *i.e.* of the whole Board of Examiners!

Even now the situation might have been retrieved by the election of other Examiners, but the greatest possible pressure was exercised to prevent any leading man-midwife from accepting the appointment; and the College of Surgeons actually had the extraordinary meekness to acquiesce in being boycotted by its own Examiners; and, merely informing us that the examination was "postponed," to give up at once its own dignity, and our single chance of registration by means of the examination for which we had been working our hardest for two months past![2] "Since then," wrote Mr. Stansfeld in 1877, "there have been no Examiners and no examination; but there was immediately a meeting of the Obstetrical

[1] *Medical Times and Gazette*, February 26, 1876.

[2] See *Note KK.*

Society, at which a vote of thanks to the members of the Examining Board was carried by 'universal acclamation.' The Obstetrical Society would appear to be still of the same mind and spirit in 1877; for they have, it would appear, submitted to Her Majesty's Government proposals for imposing special conditions on women who desire to act in England as professed midwives, which the Medical Council has not been able to endorse, because, amongst other reasons, the Society propose, in respect of midwives, that the mere act of unqualified practice should be a misdemeanour, which would be an exception to the spirit of the present law respecting unqualified medical practice for gain, and because they would reserve liberty to male persons to do what the law would forbid female persons to do under the same conditions!"[1]

There were, however, a certain number of just men in the College of Surgeons who felt the shame of the position in which they had been placed. At an interview with the Lord President of the Council, on May 16th, Sir James Paget, President of the College, stated that he "desired to vindicate the College from any wish to break faith with the women whom they had promised to admit, and explained that the present position of affairs was due solely to the unjustifiable resignation of the Examiners, who had placed the College in a most painful position." It was stated that the Duke of Richmond seemed much impressed

[1] See *Note LL.*

by Sir James' statements, and that the facts increased the probability of legislative interference. "So," adds the *Scotsman*, "the public are likely to be edified with a new and instructive version of The Biter Bit."[1]

I do not doubt for a moment that a thoroughly honourable man like Sir James Paget expressed most honestly his own feeling, and that of a minority of his colleagues; but it is only too clear that good-will towards the women was entirely wanting in the College as a whole, for the examinations in midwifery were never re-opened till the women no longer required them; and though, a few months later, full powers were given to all Examining Boards to admit candidates irrespective of sex, this College never availed itself of those powers, and it yet remains (1886) one of the few Boards that still close their portals persistently against medical women.

It may be thought that when, a few weeks ago, the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons asked a woman to lay the foundation-stone of their new Examination Hall,[2] it would have been a graceful act to announce that students of Her Majesty's sex would not henceforth be excluded from its doors, but un-

[1] See *Scotsman*, May 19, 1876. It is a rather curious fact that all details of this interview were sedulously kept out of most of the medical papers. The tone taken by Sir James was hardly likely to be palatable, for instance, to a paper capable of saying, "We are glad to find that the *spirited conduct* of Drs. Barnes, Farre, and Priestley in connection with recent events at the College of Surgeons is applauded generally by our provincial brethren."—*Lancet*, May 6, 1876.

[2] *Times*, March 25, 1886.

fortunately this view was not taken by the learned bodies in question.

While narrating this curious episode, I have not paused to notice the deputation from the London School of Medicine for Women that also waited on the Lord President about this time. It was introduced by Lord Aberdare (late Lord President), and by Mr. Stansfeld, who had also been a member of the last Cabinet. Both these gentlemen spoke strongly in favour of action by the Government, Lord Aberdare especially pointing out that it was "only by accident" and by the unforeseen combination of the nineteen Examining Boards, that women were shut out of the Medical Profession,—no such action having even been contemplated at the time of passing the Medical Act of 1858, which had been made the instrument of our exclusion.[1] Another member of the deputation, Mr. Forsyth, M.P., Q.C. (an influential supporter of the Conservative Government), also insisted strongly that the Medical Act had been wrested from its original purpose, which was solely to prescribe certain examinations and conditions for entrance into the profession, and he urged that the Government should provide a remedy, by bringing in a short Enabling Bill, making it clear that every Examining

[1] It is, by the bye, worth notice that Mr. Cowper-Temple (now Lord Mount-Temple) was in office in 1858, and, as Vice-President, was specially concerned in the passing of the Act which had had such wholly unexpected results. There was therefore a peculiar appropriateness in his zealous advocacy on our behalf.

Board could examine women if it chose to do so. The Lord President was also reminded by Mr. Stansfeld of the promise of the Vice-President that Government would be prepared with a view of their own on the question of legislation; but, although the deputation was courteously received, no further or more definite statement or promise on behalf of Her Majesty's Government was forthcoming.

Under these circumstances, the Right Hon. W. Cowper-Temple again introduced his "Foreign Degrees" Bill; but shortly afterwards, about the end of May 1876, an Enabling Bill was brought in by the Right Hon. Russell Gurney, Recorder of London, with the object of enabling every one of the nineteen Examining Boards (including the Scotch Universities) to admit women as well as men to their examinations, if they chose to do so.

"This, the Recorder's Bill, was also referred by the Lord President to the Medical Council, who discussed it on two occasions, and who reported generally in its favour, but suggested the addition of words to make it quite clear that the measure would be permissive only, and to prevent the conferring of medical qualifications upon women from carrying with it any right to take part in the government of the Examining Bodies who might have conferred them. Mr. Russell Gurney at once accepted the suggestions of the Medical Council.

"On the 5th of July Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill came

on for second reading, but was withdrawn after debate, upon a statement from Lord Sandon that the Government were prepared to support the Recorder's Bill. Even then anxiety was by no means at an end, for the Government were not prepared to make the Bill their own and to find a day for it, and any persistent opposition would have been almost necessarily fatal to its passing at so late a time; but these dangers were by good fortune escaped, and before the end of the session the Bill received the Royal assent, and became law on August 11th, 1876.[1]

"Those who favoured the admission of women to the Medical Profession were satisfied by the passing of this Act. They reasoned thus: *de deux choses l'une;* the Act will either have effect or not. If any one of the nineteen Examining Bodies avail itself of the Act, the door will be opened, other bodies will follow suit, and it will not be possible that the door should be closed again. If, on the contrary, every one of the Examining Bodies should refuse to avail themselves of the powers of the Act, the case for a compulsory measure taken up by the Government of the day will have become complete.

"Of these two alternative possible results, the former was happily and at once realized in fact. It might be thought that the University of Edinburgh would at once have resumed the initiative, in order to redeem its pledges, however late; but it set the seal on its

[1] See *Note MM.*

former procedure by now again refusing all action on behalf of its own matriculated students, and the ladies were obliged to turn elsewhere."[1]

Fortunately, however, the "logic of events" was not entirely without effect even on the medical authorities. In London we knew there was no prospect of immediate success, as the only hope lay in the probable action of the University of London, and for that time must be allowed. We saw no reason to turn hopefully to Scotland, where so much pains had been taken by our opponents to rouse all possible animosity; so we decided that Ireland should be the scene of our next application. And on September 18th, 1876, two of our ablest and most popular fellow-students, Miss Pechey and Miss Shove, started for Dublin to see what help we could get from Irish chivalry. They met in most quarters with an extremely cordial reception, and the Irish College of Physicians and the Queen's University of Ireland both assented to their request, and agreed to admit women to examinations and diplomas. The Queen's University has three affiliated Colleges, in Cork, Belfast, and Galway, and it appeared probable that at the last of these women might obtain admission to the classes required by the University. Four of the Professors, indeed, agreed to to make the necessary arrangements, but, in consequence of the virulent hostility of one man, the veto of the College Council was interposed, and

[1] Rt. Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P., *Nineteenth Century Review*, July 1877.

as the opening of the session was close at hand, no further action could be taken at the time.

The Irish College of Physicians were, however, prepared now to "recognize" our London School, and to admit women to examination on the same terms as men. Early in the following year, several of us, who had already obtained degrees in foreign Universities, were admitted to examination, and in this way women, after an interval of twelve years, again found their way on to the national Medical Register.[1]

This was, no doubt, the turning-point of the whole struggle. Theoretically the day was indeed won, but one very formidable difficulty, and only one, still remained. Those students who had not completed their education in Edinburgh or abroad, were still without any opportunity or any prospect of qualifying hospital instruction. I frankly confess that I do not think that any of us unaided could have solved the problem; but it was solved for us, and in the most satisfactory manner possible, by the unfailing kindness and indomitable energy of our friend Mr. Stansfeld, who had a year or two before agreed, at my urgent request, to become honorary treasurer of the School. Seeing the desperate need in which we stood, and that, unless hospital instruction could be secured, we might even yet be wholly defeated (at least as regards education in this

[1] See *Note NN.*

country), Mr. Stansfeld threw himself into the breach, and devoted his whole energies to induce the authorities of the Royal Free Hospital (closely adjacent to the School) to admit our students to their wards. We had applied already to the medical staff, and had met with an absolute refusal; he appealed to the lay members of the Weekly Board, and in particular to its kindly and generous chairman, Mr. James Hopgood. I will leave him to tell in his own words the result of his unwearied efforts. "Since the autumn of 1876, negotiations had been in progress with the authorities of the Royal Free Hospital in Gray's Inn Road on the part of the School. The Royal Free Hospital has *no male school.* It was upon this ground especially that the London School of Medicine for Women based their appeal, and not in vain. The Weekly Board of the Hospital replied by a resolution that, as no other metropolitan hospital appeared to be in a position to grant the required facilities, it was only *just and right* that the Royal Free Hospital should afford them. The General Committee of the Hospital confirmed the resolution of the Weekly Board. The question was discussed with every member of the medical staff, and the discussions ended in their unanimous assent. The agreement between the School and the Hospital, involving certain not inconsiderable financial obligations on the part of the School, was worked out to its present shape with

equal patience and candour on the part of the Hospital authorities, and with identical results; it was signed on the 12th of June 1877. This timely conclusion, so fortunate for the interests of women desiring to study and practise medicine in this country, and so vital to the interests of the School, is mainly due to the conviction of the justice of the claim, and to the admirable patience and tact, of Mr. James Hopgood, the chairman of the Weekly Board."

It is due to the medical staff to state that, though they had not desired in the first instance to admit women, their reception of them and subsequent treatment has been loyal and kind in the extreme. Few students have had such opportunities of instruction as have been given by Dr. Cockle, Mr. Gant, Mr. Rose, Dr. Allen Sturge, Dr. Sainsbury, Mr. Anderson Critchett, Dr. S. West, the late lamented Dr. Buchanan Baxter,[1] and Mr. James Shuter, and many others; and the very large amount of very varied practice both in the Hospital and in the out-patient department have afforded a most excellent field for clinical teaching and experience.

And so the great fight was practically ended.[2] The last barrier was thrown down, and at last a "fair field and no favour" were really won. Many minor matters still needed rectification, and I am glad to

[1] Mrs. Baxter has most kindly given to the School nearly 200 volumes from Dr. Baxter's library, in memory of his interest in its welfare.

[2] See *Note 00.*

say that the subsequent nine years have shown no empty record; but when once medical education, hospital instruction, examination on the usual lines, and admission to the national Register, were won, all the rest was a mere matter of time; and if my story ended here it would still be full-rounded and complete. But I hope in the few following pages to specify the most memorable events that have since happened, and to give some brief outline of the present position of women in the medical profession in Great Britain and in other countries, respecting which I have been able to obtain information.

As soon as the School was made complete by its association with the Royal Free Hospital, it was decided to call a public meeting, and appeal to those interested in the question for funds for the next five years, as the liberal donations with which the School had been started were now exhausted. Lord Shaftesbury kindly consented to preside at St. George's Hall on June 25th, 1877, and a very large attendance of friends indicated the wide interest felt in the object of the meeting. The Hon. Treasurer, Mr. Stansfeld, laid the position of the School before the public, and appealed for a fund of £5000 to meet the estimated expenses of the next five years. The appeal was most ably supported by Professor Fawcett, M.P., Right Hon. W. Cowper-Temple, M.P., Dr. Chambers, Dr. Garrett Anderson, Dr. Cameron, M.P., and others.

One short but very interesting speech was made by Lady Anna Gore Langton, who had just returned from India, and who bore personal testimony to the need of more medical women for the relief of suffering among their sisters in India. It was most gratifying to find that more than half the amount asked for was subscribed before the close of the meeting; and the remainder, with some surplus beyond, was all contributed before the end of the year. Early in 1878 the School received a most welcome endowment, in the shape of a legacy, valued at about £7000,[1] from Mrs. George Oakes, of New South Wales, and this, it was hoped, would, as students increased, go far to prevent the necessity of constantly recurring appeals to the public purse. It seems quite legitimate that in the early days of any such institution special help should be accorded, but I do not think it would be conducive to the self-respect of medical women that their Schools should ultimately be otherwise than self-supporting.

In 1878, when I myself went to settle in practice in Edinburgh, it was a great pleasure to me to hand over the labouring oar at the School to my valued friend Mrs. Thorne, who had been one of our most distinguished fellow-students in Edinburgh, and who, in consequence of family circumstances, had decided

[1] The legacy being in the shape of bank shares, which were shortly afterwards much depreciated, did not ultimately realize so large a sum.

not to proceed to graduation and registration (as she would have done if the opportunity had been offered earlier), but to rest content with the position she had attained, viz. that of a fully educated physician, without the legal recognition which would have been essential if she had intended to enter into practice. Those who know, as I do, her rare intellectual powers and attainments, her complete self-abnegation, her absolute loyalty to her fellow-workers, and her very unusual power of commanding the respect and affection of all with whom she comes in contact, cannot refrain from a sigh of regret that one of our very best women doctors *in posse* should be lost to the profession; and yet I know not how we can regret her choice, when we see the absolutely inestimable services she has rendered, and is still rendering, to the successive generations of medical women students, while "the unselfish worker in her work is hid."[1]

Now that I have recorded how the great difficulties were surmounted, I have not much more to say respecting the School, which, with various changes in its teaching staff from time to time[2] has steadily pursued a quiet course of usefulness, with a most gratifying measure of success in its results, of some

[1] "Noiseless as light that melts the darkness is,
He wrought as duty led and honour bid;
No trumpet heralds victories like his,
The unselfish worker in his work is hid."
—WHITTIER'S *Lines on the Hon. Samuel E. Sewall.*

[2] See *Note HH.*

of which I shall have to speak subsequently. In 1883, our faithful friend Mr. Norton was compelled, by constantly increasing pressure of professional work, to resign the Deanship, and Dr. Garrett Anderson, who had previously been Hon. Librarian, as well as one of the lecturers, was appointed his successor. The list of Vice-Presidents and of Governors of the School has been constantly increasing, and now numbers many very influential names. The roll of students also has shown steady increase; during the present session (1885–86) the number in attendance is 43, and the whole number who have been admitted since 1874 is 151.

In an able and kindly article recently published,[1] I am glad to see that the writer, himself a student, if not a graduate, in Medicine, credits the School with most complete equipment and most thorough work, and is indeed disposed to think that the "golden opportunities" offered to its students are in excess of those at most of the medical schools for men. How this may be I do not venture to pronounce, but I do think it likely that a larger percentage of thoroughly earnest work is done there than at most medical colleges. What is dearly bought is usually proportionately prized, and though the present generation of women students find a smooth path before them,

[1] "*Æsculapia Victrix*," by Robert Wilson, *Fortnightly Review*, January 1886. I am glad to recognize in the writer a kind friend of the old Edinburgh days.

they can hardly have forgotten the traditions of the days from which their predecessors so recently emerged. Besides, when women study medicine they usually do so as something more than a matter of choice, whereas, of course, we know that a large proportion of male students have no special predilection for their profession, and merely take it up for secondary reasons.

As I have referred to Mr. Wilson's article, I can hardly avoid correcting a very curious error into which he has fallen, when he writes, "The great majority of English medical women undoubtedly marry either before or soon after they complete their curriculum." This statement struck me as so extraordinary, and so opposed to the facts of the case, that I turned at once to the list of fifty women [1] who, up to January 1st, 1886, have placed their names on the British Register. I find the fact to be that out of these fifty, just ten, or exactly one-fifth, have married "either before or soon after they completed their curriculum;" that three more began to study medicine during marriage, and five after widowhood (one of these having studied for a short time before marriage); and that the remaining thirty-two (about two-thirds of the whole) have never married at all. It is therefore clear that the author of "*Æsculapia Victrix*" has been under some strange misconception in the matter. To complete my statement, I may say

[1] See *Note NN.*

that out of about 160 or 170 women who have studied medicine in this country since 1869, I know of only eight or ten who have given up their studies in order to marry; and I think this number may compare favourably with the very considerable proportion of young men who, for one reason or other, give up medical study at some stage, so that women need not be supposed in this respect to be in an exceptional position.

Of course no sensible person would wish that women who study medicine should take vows of celibacy; but it is in the nature of things probable that those whose whole minds are devoted to an engrossing pursuit will less readily than others contemplate a complete change of life and circumstances; and, while we have conclusive proof that women *may* marry and yet succeed in medical practice, I believe most people will agree with me in thinking it in most cases undesirable to "serve two masters" in such emphatic fashion, and will consider those women most wise who deliberately take their choice *either* to marry or to devote themselves to a learned profession, which will in itself make sufficiently onerous demands on all their faculties and all their energies.

It should be noted that no student is admitted to the London School before she has completed her eighteenth year; and on admission each is required to sign a declaration stating her intention to go through the whole course of study, and to pass the

examinations necessary for registration. The only exceptions are in the case of ladies desiring to take a class or two for scientific purposes, and such students sign a declaration stating that they have no intention of entering the medical profession; in which case study is allowed, but no certificates of attendance are given. This measure was found to be necessary, in order to prevent the entrance of foolish persons, who fancied that, after taking "a few classes," they might consider themselves competent to practise as medical missionaries or otherwise, and whose incompetency would have brought disaster to their patients, and discredit on the School and on the movement at large. As I think the *thoroughness* of training a point of quite infinite importance, I am glad to quote the following admirable protest on the subject, contained in an inaugural address given at the School on October 1st, 1878, by one of our ablest medical women, Dr. Edith Pechey:—

"There may be another class here, who study not from any special taste for medical pursuits, but as a means to an end; in order, namely, that they may be more useful in the future they have planned for themselves. I refer to medical missionaries. And if there are any such here, may I be permitted to hope that you are all working for the degree of the London University; not because I consider the examination of the London University a better one than that of the College of Physicians of Ireland, but the curriculum is wider. Go out with the best credentials possible, and as you belong to two professions, see that you serve both faithfully. I confess that I have been somewhat horrified to hear occasionally remarks from the supporters of medical missions, to the effect that a diploma is not necessary, that a full curriculum is superfluous—in fact, that a mere smattering is sufficient for such students. I cannot believe that such sentiments are held by the students themselves, and if

there are any here to-day, I beg of you not for one moment to give way to this idea. Is human life worth less in other lands, amongst people of another faith? or do such persons imagine that disease there is of a simpler nature, and that the heathen, like the wicked, are 'not in trouble as other men'? It is true that the English, with their luxurious habits, have brought down a heap of troubles upon themselves, and that amongst nations with a simpler mode of life you will find less material for the study of the indigestions and the nervous ailments which form so large a part of the doctor's practice in this country. Yet, though the enemy wear a different face, he will still have to be fought, and the struggle will require as much science and skill there as here. Therefore be well prepared, and do your work well. 'Christian England' is renowned in every land for her adulterated goods; let it not be said that under the very guise of Christianity the medical help she sends out is also an inferior article. Let it not be said of you hereafter, as was said of some medical missionaries more than one hundred years ago, 'The usual introduction and security of these missionaries is the pretence to the practice of physic, that in destroying bodies they may save souls,'[1] but let your practice prove you a worthy member of the profession, by saving life, or, where that is impossible, by lessening pain and smoothing the passage to the grave. Remember, too, that you have an additional incentive to the study of the auxiliary sciences of biology and botany, in view of the exceptionally advantageous position in which you are likely to be placed for their pursuit; and that it may be in your power to benefit mankind by additions to our knowledge of these sciences, if you undergo a training here which will enable you to take advantage of the resources open to you in the Fauna and Flora of countries hitherto little explored."

The next event of great importance was the opening to women of the University of London, whose degrees, especially in medicine, stand probably higher than those of any other University in the kingdom. It was, I believe, in 1862 that Miss Garrett made the first application for admission ever made by a woman; and when her request was brought before the Senate, it was strongly supported by the Vice-

[1] *Discourse on Inoculation*, by La Condamine. Preface by Translator (Maty). 1755.

Chancellor, Mr. Grote, who argued that "when a University is constituted as ours is, for the purpose of encouraging a high measure of scientific and literary studies, *the plainest principles of justice require that we should . . . deal equally with both sexes;* that we should acknowledge the female minority as well as the male majority, and that, after having determined proper conditions of examination, we should admit persons of the sex of Mrs. Somerville to be examined, as well as persons of the sex of La Place."[1] Novel as the proposition must then have seemed, it is curious to remember how very nearly Mr. Grote carried the day, his motion being rejected by the chairman's casting vote only! Strange to think that if one man had voted differently, the result would have been anticipated by sixteen years, and almost the whole conditions of the intervening period have been changed! As it was, however, I believe the question did not come up again until 1874, when, after the remarkable memorial of which I spoke previously, a motion was brought forward, not this time in the Senate, but in Convocation, to the effect "that it is desirable that women should be permitted to take degrees in the University of London." Of course the usual speeches were made about taking women out of their spheres, encouraging competition with men, etc., but the motion was carried by 81 votes to 65.[2]

[1] *Times*, January 15, 1878.

[2] *Times*, May 13, 1874.

It appeared, however, that nothing could be done without legislation, as under the existing charter there was no power to grant degrees to women.

On January 18th, 1876, the matter was again brought forward by Mr. Hensman, who moved, "That it is desirable that a new charter be granted to the University, and that such charter should enable the University to grant degrees in Arts to women." The words "in Arts" were probably inserted to avoid medical opposition, but it was ultimately agreed to omit them, and in its enlarged form the motion was carried "almost unanimously."[1]

Within a few months the position was materially changed by the passing of Mr. Russell Gurney's Act, which empowered *all* the Examining Boards to examine women in medicine, and to grant them the ordinary diplomas; so that to this extent the hands of the University were set free, though a new charter, or a special Act, would still be required to throw open non-medical degrees to women. A month or two later (in December 1876), one of our best students, Miss Edith Shove, made formal application to the University for admission to medical examinations and degrees; and on February 18th, 1877, Mr. Smith Osler moved in the Senate that her request should be granted. This motion was carried by 14 votes to 7; the majority consisting of the Chancellor (Lord Granville), Vice-Chancellor (Sir John Lubbock,

[1] *Daily Telegraph*, January 19, 1876.

M.P.), Lord Kimberley, Dr. Billing, Mr. Fitch, Sir William Gull, Mr. Heywood, Mr. Hutton, the Master of the Rolls (Right Hon. Sir G. Jessel), Right Hon. R. Lowe, M.P., Mr. Osler, Sir James Paget, Lord Arthur Russell, and Dr. William Smith. The minority consisted of Lord Cardwell, the Dean of Lincoln, Mr. Goldsmid, Sir William Jenner, Dr. Quain, Dr. Sharpey, and Dr. Storrar.

It is pleasant to record that among the medical men who voted in favour of women was Dr. Archibald Billing, the "father of the profession," who took his own degree at Oxford in 1818. Sir James Paget and Sir William Gull also showed by their vote on this occasion that they had "the courage of their opinions" as previously expressed, in spite of very bitter opposition from a certain section of the medical profession.

In the previous month (January 1877) Convocation had again considered the question of the admission of women, and pronounced on it favourably by 22 votes to 16; but a desperate effort was now to be made by the reactionary party, consisting chiefly of medical graduates. They did not, however, venture to raise the direct issue, which had already been three times decided in Convocation, but endeavoured to excite opposition to the action of the Senate, because, instead of proceeding by a new charter, they had determined in the first instance to avail themselves of the Russell Gurney Act, which empowered them to grant medical degrees only.

At a meeting, then, of Convocation on May 8th, 1877, there was a battle royal. It was announced that a memorial, signed by 230 medical graduates (out of about 444), had been presented to the Senate against their proposed action, and the obstructive party brought forward and carried, by 144 votes to 116, the resolution, "That it is inadvisable for this University to admit women to degrees in Medicine, before it shall have considered the general question of their admission to the degrees of all Faculties." This motion was brought forward by one of the Examiners in Surgery, Mr. Savory, who urged that "the medical graduates were the best and most impartial (!) judges of the question," seconded by Dr. Barnes, who declared that "there were matters in which it was impossible for a medical man with a proper sense of self-respect to teach or examine women," and supported by Sir William Jenner, who brought up the old trades-union argument that "much injury would be done to the present medical graduates, because the value of the London degree would be lowered in the eyes of the public."[1] Dr. Wilson Fox, moreover, declared it to be "a fallacy that women desired to be attended by women," and in fact the whole tone of the debate showed that it was the medical monopoly that was really felt to be at stake, although the form of the motion gave it an appearance of liberality which probably secured sup-

[1] *Lancet*, May 12, 1877.

port from some, who thought it better that the whole question should be thoroughly thrashed out and decided once for all. It is, however, worth notice that 105 medical graduates voted with the majority, and only 9 with the minority.[1] At any rate it was clear what view was taken of the matter, when the *Lancet* declared in a leading article that "We are pleased to be able to state that the members of Convocation have refused by a decisive majority to 'thank the Senate for their resolution to admit women to degrees in Medicine.' The advocates *for the admission of women into our ranks* have therefore been signally defeated in one of their strongholds."

The medical obstructives would not, however, have been quite so jubilant had the gift of prophecy been vouchsafed to them, for the strong effort made by them to impede the current of events only brought out with much greater force, and with a far more "decisive majority," the triumph of justice and liberality. The Senate acquiesced in the view taken by Convocation (though not in the purposes of those by whom the late motion had been carried); and when, on January 15th, 1878, a new Charter, admitting women to *all* degrees, was laid by the Senate before Convocation, its approval was carried by an overwhelming majority (241 to 132), in what was probably the largest meeting of Convocation ever held, in spite of the rather melodramatic eloquence

[1] *Lancet*, May 26, 1877.

of Sir William Jenner, who pathetically assured Convocation that he "had but one dear daughter, and he would rather follow her to her grave than allow her to go through such a course of study."[1]

The composition of majority and minority was very significant. For the new charter there were 241 votes, comprising those of 22 graduates in Medicine, 33 in Science, 28 in Law, and 148 in Arts. On the other side 132 votes were recorded, comprising 83 graduates in Medicine, 4 in Science, 9 in Law, and 36 in Arts. Now, therefore, thanks to the exclusionist party, all the examinations of this leading British University were thrown open to women; and the large number of degrees granted to them during the years that have since elapsed, has been the best proof alike of the justice and of the wisdom of the concession; though, at the same time, it must be allowed that the results have brought also full justification for the fears and forebodings of the exclusionist party, who were so painfully anxious that the relative capacities and acquirements of men and women should *not* be brought to the test.

It is not, I think, so generally known as it should be, that the University of London is the only Examining Board in the three kingdoms which has sufficient confidence in its own searching examinations to judge candidates (so far as papers are concerned) by the results alone, without knowing or seeking to know

[1] *Standard*, January 16, 1878.

anything of the name or sex of the writers, who are distinguished by numbers only. Here then was an ideal opportunity for deciding whether or not the "smaller brains" could be unhesitatingly identified, and separated out from the "male minds of the Caucasian race," and the fact that the examinations have the reputation of being by far the most severe in the kingdom (too severe, indeed, as many think), made the test the more thorough and satisfactory. The results, then, seemed to me a matter of very great interest, and, without knowing how the case would turn out, I made it my business a year or two ago to go over and analyze carefully the figures given in the University Calendar for the first five years after the admission of women, *i.e.* from the end of 1878 to the end of 1883. I will give them in the Faculties of Arts and Medicine only, as any one interested in the matter can complete the list by reference to the Calendar.

For the Matriculation Examination during these five years, 7208 men went up and 3712 passed, *i.e.* 51·5 per cent.; 619 women went up and 427 passed, *i.e.* 69 per cent.

For the next examination, the "Intermediate in Arts," 1635 men went up and 938 passed, or 57·3 per cent.; 139 women went up and 107 passed, or 77 per cent.

For the final B.A. Examination, 833 men went up and 408 passed, *i.e.* not quite 49 per cent.; 68 women

went up and 50 passed, or rather more than 73 per cent.

Now, as regards degrees in Medicine. For the first professional or "Preliminary Scientific" Examination, 1027 men went up and 538 passed, or 52·3 per cent.; 20 women went up and 12 passed, or 60 per cent.

For the second or "Intermediate Examination in Medicine," 431 men went up and 240 passed, or 55·6 per cent.; 7 women went up and 6 passed, or 85·7 per cent.

For the final M.B. Examination, 116 men went up and 91 passed, or 78·4 per cent.; for this only 3 women had gone up (to the end of 1883) and *all* have passed, *i.e.* 100 per cent.

For the M.A. and M.D. degree no woman was ready during the first five years, and therefore there are no figures to give.

Truly it is a dreadful and lamentable thing for people like Professor Turner and Dr. Henry Bennet when theories are thus brought to the undesired test of practical results!

It is pleasant, moreover, to record that in two cases the gold medal of the University has been awarded to a woman, after competition with all other students of the year,—viz. in Anatomy, to Miss Helen Prideaux in 1881, and in Obstetrics, to Mrs. Scharlieb in 1882. In several other instances, also, ladies have appeared in the honours list.

Having mentioned Miss Prideaux, I cannot refrain

from adding a few words to express the universal grief felt at the premature death of one of our most brilliant medical women, and to place on record the following graceful tribute from Sir William Gull, who took the chair at a meeting in relation to a memorial Scholarship founded in her honour.

"They had met that day to establish a Scholarship in Medicine, in memory of Miss Helen Prideaux, a Bachelor of Medicine of the University of London, who last year died of diphtheria, on the eve of presenting herself for the final M.D. degree. Miss Prideaux, whose character and intellectual endowments he highly extolled, had vindicated the right of women to take the highest position in a difficult and intellectual profession. In the course of her studies she obtained, at the University of London, the exhibition and gold medal in Anatomy, the highest award in that difficult department of medical studies ; and later on she took a first class in Medicine and other subjects. In the dim and now distant past, one objection that was strongly felt against the admission of women to the University degrees was, that it might lead to a lowering of the standard of proficiency. Miss Prideaux, by heading the honours list, had answered this objection, and swept away this prejudice from the path of all who might follow her. For himself he confessed that he had opposed the admission of women to medical studies, in common with many of his distinguished colleagues, and looking as carefully as he could into the motives which then prevailed with him, and he had no doubt with them too, there was a misgiving that in practice the good work of medicine might be deteriorated, and without a sufficient opposing check. But when the movement acquired force, and the Legislature had, by their Act and by a charter to the University, confirmed the rights of women to an equal claim with men to University examination, it seemed to him that it would have been unfair and factious on his part longer to have stood in opposition. His duty was, therefore, to take quite another position, and in the best spirit of chivalry he could command to promote what had thus far been proved a desirable object. In taking the chair at that meeting, for founding a Medical Scholarship to be awarded to women,—for the furtherance of their medical studies after qualification for practice,—he felt himself charged with a very high and honourable duty, both to his profession and to society. The spirit of medicine was one of intellectual freedom, and, in accordance with that, they would place

the Helen Prideaux Memorial high over that lower atmosphere of personal contentions and current opinions which were but for the day. . . . To the less elevated mind Medicine was apt to become a mere trade; to the more elevated and better educated, it was a profession; but in woman—he believed also in man, but more especially in woman—it needed the character of a religion where high sentiment quickened and directed all actions. This work of women, conducted as Miss Helen Prideaux and other of her colleagues showed it could be, must favourably react upon the whole profession."[1]

Four women besides Miss Prideaux and Mrs. Scharlieb have now (March 1886) obtained the degree of M.B. Lond., viz. Miss Edith Shove, Miss Emily Tomlinson, Miss Lœtitia Bernard, and Miss Mary Pailthorpe. No woman has as yet proceeded to the degree of M.D. Lond.

It is a matter of interest that Miss Shove was the first woman to receive a medical post in the Civil Service, being appointed by Mr. Fawcett, when Postmaster-General, as medical officer to the female staff of the General Post Office. Two other minor medical appointments in the Post Office have also been given to women, viz. one in Manchester to Dr. Anna Dahms, and one in Liverpool to Miss Cradock.

Besides the six graduates of London University, mentioned above, forty-two other ladies have (up to January 1st, 1886) been enabled to place their names on the Register by means of the diplomas of the Irish College of Physicians.[2] The Royal University of Ireland, which took the place of the Queen's Univer-

[1] *British Medical Journal*, Feb. 27, 1886.

[2] For a complete list see *Note NN.*

sity, now also admits women to its examinations (as residence at special Colleges is no longer required), and several women are preparing for its degree, though it has not as yet been received by any.

The position of the Victoria University is thus explained by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Greenwood :—

"Women are admitted to the degree examinations of the Victoria University on the same conditions as men. This University, however, like the older Universities,[1] but unlike the London University, requires of its candidates, or rather presupposes, systematic study in some College of the University. Hence it follows that admission to its degrees can only be gained by membership of a College. At present there are two Colleges only, Owen's College, Manchester, and University College, Liverpool, and neither of these Colleges admit women students in the *department of Medicine.*"

This degree, therefore, though theoretically thrown open, is practically unattainable by women, until one of the Colleges is also opened to them.

Within the last year two extremely important steps in advance have been taken, by the opening of the doors of the Irish College of Surgeons in 1885, and of the conjoint examination of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons of Edinburgh and Glasgow in

[1] This is, I believe, true as regards Cambridge, but not as regards Oxford, at least so far as medical degrees are concerned. On this point Dr. King Chambers remarks :—"The best example is that set by the University of Oxford, which for the medical degrees demands no certificates of attendance at lectures at all. She feels herself competent to discover, by a searching examination, the knowledge and readiness acquired by the candidates,—in fact, to exercise the true functions of an examining body. Those corporations who do not take the trouble to do this, but trust to the certificates of teachers, should be cashiered at an early date."—*Harveian Oration, Royal College of Physicians*, 1871, with two Sequels. Lea & Co., Philadelphia, 1871. (Why, then, does Oxford not examine women ?)

February 1886.[1] In the former case the concession is made as full and complete as possible, as will be seen by the following letter from the secretary :—

"Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland,
Dublin, *February* 17, 1886.

"Madam,—By clause 14 of a new charter, granted to the College on May 23, 1885, all provisions of the charter, etc., referring to education, examination, and diplomas, have been extended to include women (see page 60 of Calendar of the College). Arrangements have been made in the school of this College to enable female students to dissect separately from the general class, and all lectures are open to them.

"I beg to forward a complete set of our Regulations, and shall be glad to afford further information.

"Yours truly,

"A. H. Jacob, F.R.C.S.I.,
"*Secretary of Council.*"

"Dr. S. Jex-Blake."

In Edinburgh and Glasgow there is no school properly belonging to the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, but candidates preparing for the "triple qualification in Medicine, Surgery, and Midwifery," granted by the conjoined Colleges, receive their education in the Extra-mural Schools of the two cities, where a large choice of teachers is afforded them. I understand from the secretary of the Edinburgh Extra-mural School, that when the decision of the Colleges was made public a few weeks ago, the question of the admission of women to the classes was considered at a meeting of the whole body of lecturers, and that it was decided that each lecturer should be

[1] See *Times*, *Standard*, *Glasgow Herald*, and *Daily Review* of March 10, 1886.

at liberty to make such arrangements as he thought proper, either with a view to mixed or separate classes. In fact the Extra-mural School as a whole has re-asserted the position taken up by the lecturers of Surgeons' Hall in July 1870, as distinct from their retrograde action in July 1871, which latter, however, had never affected the great body of lecturers.[1] The whole question has been so recently re-opened, that it has not as yet been possible to complete the necessary arrangements; but I venture confidently to anticipate that before the beginning of the winter session, in October next, everything will be in working order for the admission of women once more to medical classes in the Scottish capital.[2]

If this anticipation is verified, there will be in truth little more to desire, and the victory of the medical women will be practically complete "all along the line." Examining Boards are already open to women in each of the three kingdoms, and I trust that next October will find medical classes open to them in each of the three capitals, as is already the case in London and Dublin. Those who remember the condition of affairs at the beginning of 1869, when

[1] See pp. 87, 113.

[2] It may be of interest to mention that already (within a month after the opening of the Scotch colleges) I have had applications and enquiries about classes in Edinburgh from sixteen women; but as it seems probable that separate classes will have to be organized, the additional expense presents a great difficulty to many. I venture to hope that friends will once more come forward, to enable me to offer one or more scholarships to those who need such assistance.

no means of medical education was open to women, and the door of every Examining Board, and therefore of the national Register, was closed against them, may well, I think, be satisfied with the results attained in the intervening seventeen years. There are of course some anomalies left: it is absurd that Universities or other Examining Boards should be allowed to pick and choose at all between the candidates who may present themselves; and it is still more objectionable that public money, derived from ratepayers of both sexes, should be devoted to the education of one sex only. These things, however, "have been abundantly proved, and will soon go near to be believed," and we may, I think, leave all the remaining questions with perfect confidence in the hands of the public and of the Legislature. The longer legislation is deferred, both as regards the medical profession and also the universities of the three kingdoms, the more certain will it be that justice and equity will dictate the measures finally enacted, and probably a very short time will see the termination of any yet existing inequalities. As I wrote in 1872, and may with added confidence repeat now, "In all such struggles a present triumph may be snatched by those in brief authority, but the future belongs inalienably to the cause of justice and liberality."[1]

It is satisfactory to find, as time goes on, that public opinion is growing more and more strongly in favour

[1] *Medical Women*, p. 120, first edition, 1872.

of the employment of medical women; in fact, that the demand increases so much more rapidly than the supply, that when I myself wanted a house-surgeon a few months ago for my little Cottage Hospital, none was for some time available, although about forty-five women were at that time on the Register.[1] Of the need of them in India and elsewhere in the East I shall hope to speak subsequently, but I will in the first instance give what information I can as to their work in this country. It is proverbially difficult to get accurate statistics as to private practice, but it is very well known that several medical women have obtained a large practice with much greater rapidity than is usual among young medical men. I was particularly curious to see what practical experience would prove in Edinburgh, where we had been so often and so loudly assured that there was "no demand at all" for medical women, and during the first year of my practice (July 1st, 1878 to July 1st, 1879), I took the trouble to keep an exact account of the work required of me. It may be of some interest to mention that during that period I find recorded in my books 574 visits to or from private patients; and in the first twelve months during which my Dispensary was open (twice a week only) the number of visits from patients there was 2464. This was the more remarkable, as showing distinct *choice* in the matter, as the Dispensary Committee

[1] *Daily Review*, September 25, 1885.

made a charge of threepence for medicines at each visit, whereas most of the other Dispensaries in Edinburgh were entirely free. Within the last few months a small Cottage Hospital has been added to the Dispensary; and was opened by the Lord Provost of Edinburgh on September 23rd, 1885.[1]

The first Dispensary worked in this country by medical women was opened in London in 1866 by Miss Garrett, with whom Dr. Morgan (who obtained her degree at Zurich) was afterwards associated. In the first five years more than 40,000 visits were made to it, by a total of 9000 patients; and 250 cases of midwifery were attended in connection with it. Early in 1872 additional premises were taken, and a small Hospital of ten beds opened in connection with the Dispensary.[2] The Hospital was subsequently removed to larger premises at 222 Marylebone Road, where 26 beds are now available. In the last report (1885) I find it stated that during the previous year 242 patients were admitted to the Hospital, and a total of 13,261 visits paid to the Dispensary. The staff now consists of four visiting physicians, viz. Dr. Garrett Anderson, Dr. Atkins, Dr. Marshall, and Mrs. De la Cherois, as well as an assistant and a resident physician. The total income and expenditure for the year amounted to about £2100.[3]

[1] *Edinburgh Courant*, September 24, 1885.

[2] *The Queen*, July 13, 1872.

[3] The Annual Report and all particulars can be obtained from the hon. secretary, Miss Vincent, 222 Marylebone Road, N.W.

In 1881 another Dispensary for women and children was established at 117 Portobello Road, Notting Hill, under the charge of Dr. Mary Marshall. This Dispensary, being on the provident system, shows a somewhat smaller attendance, but still brings out clearly enough the distinct wish of women for women doctors. During 1883 there were 162 members on the books, with 1181 consultations at the Dispensary, and 127 visits to the patients' homes. The receipts and expenditure for the first two years amounted to £133.

There are also three provincial Dispensaries managed by medical women. One at Bristol is conducted by Dr. Eliza Dunbar, and from the last report I find that 1805 visits were paid to it during the year 1885, the number of new patients being 456. Another at Leeds has been under the charge of Dr. Alice Ker, and the visits during the past year were 811. The third Dispensary, under Dr. Anna Dahms at Manchester, has not as yet published any report.

It is pleasant to record that in connection with the work of such hospitals and dispensaries, and with the requirements also of private practice, there is now, so far as I know, never any difficulty in obtaining the help and co-operation of leading medical men in each locality. Personally I cannot speak too gratefully of the abundant facilities that I have always had for consultation with the most eminent surgeons and physicians in Edinburgh. My experience, indeed, is that it is seldom among the men whose personal

superiority needs no assertion that any jealousy of women's claims is found. So far as animosity yet lurks, however, in any section of the profession, it is certainly among the "men-midwives" *et hoc genus omne* that it finds its place. No more significant illustration of this feeling could be given than the rejection of Dr. Garrett Anderson as a member of the Obstetrical Society in 1874, when it was decided that it was quite irrelevant to consider whether the admission of women doctors, with their superior opportunities of observation, might advance obstetric science.[1] It was, I confess, with intense amusement that, in full remembrance of this incident, I read the following urgent application handed to me by Dr. M'Laren a few years later :—

"Obstetrical Society's Library,
October 9th, 1879.

"Madam,—Having endeavoured in vain to procure through the booksellers your Thèse, *Etudes sur les Flexions de l'Uterus*, I have been directed to apply to yourself for it.—I am, Madam, your obedient servant,

"Thomas Watson, *Librarian.*

"Dr. Agnes M'Laren."

With her usual inexhaustible good-nature, Dr. M'Laren sent a copy of her thesis, without any comment, and received a formal note of thanks from the Hon. Secretaries, in the name of the Obstetrical Society, which apparently does not, after all, disdain to avail itself of women's brains, if it can do so without making any return for their services.

[1] See *Note PP.*

Another instance from a similar quarter, cited and commented on by Mr. Stansfeld, is worth quoting. "It is curious to notice how persistent hostility still finds its stronghold in the ranks of those practitioners who have devoted themselves to the special treatment of the diseases of women, and to the practice of midwifery. Can it be that they, more than others, tremble for their monopoly? One would be reluctant to think so; and yet how else can we explain the exceptionally marked opposition in this quarter, to which I have already alluded in my previous paper, and of which a new illustration has just occurred in the last few weeks, in the flat refusal of the medical staff of the Soho Square Hospital for women to allow a woman physician to enter their doors.[1] Such exclusion of a registered practitioner from such a hospital, would, at any rate, be sufficiently unusual; but it is rendered more glaring in this instance, by the fact that the following special invitation stands in the printed report of the Hospital. 'The medical staff, anxious that the practice of the Hospital should be made generally available for the advancement of the branch of medicine to which this Hospital is devoted, are *at all times happy to receive the visits of their professional brethren.*' I understand that when the lady in question appealed to the lay authorities of the Hospital, their opinion was almost unanimous in her favour, but that they felt unable to interfere. It is,

[1] See *Note QQ.*

however, difficult to believe that the general public, by whose contributions the Hospital is supported, would be willing to acquiesce in any such exclusion; and it is to be hoped that the medical staff will reconsider their decision, and not allow such facts to *donner à penser* to their lay coadjutors."[1]

Whatever difference of opinion may still exist as to the need for and usefulness of medical women in Europe, I imagine that few people will be bold enough at the present day to dispute the urgent necessity that exists for their services in India and other parts of the East, where native customs make it practically impossible that women should be attended by medical men. No testimony on this point can be stronger or more conclusive than that given by Surgeon-General Balfour in an official letter to the Madras Government, dated April 16th, 1872.[2]

"Of all the Mohammedan women, and of the women of the higher castes of the Hindoos who adopt the Mohammedan custom of seclusion, but a very small part have received the benefit of the medical knowledge available for their sisters in Europe and America; and *I estimate that of the hundred million of women in India, at least two-thirds are by their social customs debarred alike from receiving the visits of a medical man*

[1] This passage occurs in the *Postscript* appended by Right Hon. J. Stansfeld to his Essay when it was reprinted in pamphlet form by the Edinburgh Committee for Securing Medical Education to Women. A few copies are still in hand, and can be had on application to myself, or to the *Hon. Secretary* of the Committee, Edinburgh.

[2] This quotation, with much of the information that follows, is taken from an official "Circular Memorandum, No. 4218," which was issued by the Madras Government in 1874.

at their own homes, and from attending for gratuitous advice at the public hospitals and dispensaries. . . . To send among those classes women educated in the medical art, seems to be the only means of providing them with scientific medical aid. . . . If a Mohammedan woman or Hindoo of the higher castes be attacked with any severe disease, or have any bones injured, neither of them obtain the benefit of the knowledge which is at their doors, because it is only as yet in the possession of medical men, and *men are not admissible* into the women's presence."[1]

As early as 1866 there seem to have been urgent demands for "educating women of good caste, so as to qualify them to treat female patients and children."[2]

The first effort to supply this pressing need was apparently made at Bareilly, where, in 1867, Surgeon Corbyn started a school for teaching medicine to native women, under the auspices of a rich native gentleman, Baboo Gunga Pershad. In 1870, Dr. Corbyn wrote as follows :—

"I am educating a number of native girls, and three have already passed as native doctors. They are of all castes—Christian, Mohammedans, and Hindoos. My school is divided into three classes. The first-class pupils can read and write English and Urdu with accuracy. They are taught medicine, surgery, midwifery, diseases of women and children (especially the latter two). The second class learn anatomy, materia medica, and physiology, in English and Urdu. The pupils of the other (preparatory) class are taught English and Urdu. We have a female

---

[1] "In many parts of India—I think I may say most parts—native ladies are entirely shut out from any medical assistance, however great may be their need, because no man who is not one of the family can enter their apartments or see them ; and though thousands thus die from neglect and want of timely help, yet nothing can be done to assist them until we have ladies willing and able to act in a medical capacity."

—*The Queen*, June 8, 1872.

[2] *Delhi Gazette*, 1866.

ward attached to the dispensary for women and children, and these girls entirely attend to them, under my and the sub-assistants' supervision. It is wonderful how they can manipulate: they have plenty of nerve."[1]

In 1871, Surgeon Tomkyns reported that "the institution is in a flourishing condition, and has turned out several good useful women, not only as midwives, but as general practitioners."

More recently we learn that "the Mohammedan Nawab of Rampoor has presented to the Bareilly Mission a large building for the purpose of a medical school for women. Several women are now going through a scientific course of instruction."[2]

It was felt, however, that an adequate supply of first-rate medical women could not be obtained by this means; and in 1872, Surgeon-General Balfour advised the Madras Government to allow women to be admitted to the Medical College in Madras, to study either in mixed or separate classes as might be thought most desirable. He also proposed that an inferior class of women should be trained in Midwifery only. It appears that at that time a few women had already been instructed in the art of vaccination, and employed by the Superintendent-General of Vaccination in Madras to go into households where men were not admitted; and their great usefulness supplied a further argument for the proposed scheme.

It seems, however, that further action in the matter was deferred until July 1874, when three

[1] *Scotsman*, Oct. 26, 1870.

[2] *Brit. Med. Journal*, May 25, 1872.

ladies[1] applied for admission to the Madras Medical College, and a month later three other applications were made. This brought the question to a point. The matter was referred to Dr. Furnell, acting Principal of the Medical College, and he reported that in his opinion, "If the ladies desirous of becoming doctors are in earnest in their work, they must be prepared to attend the courses of lectures, with the exception perhaps of midwifery and surgery (and one or two lectures in anatomy and physiology), with the students of the opposite sex." He also suggested that an alternative arrangement might be adopted, allowing women either to study for the ordinary M.D. degree, on precisely the usual terms, or for an inferior diploma with a more restricted course of study. All these proposals were adopted by the Government, and in 1875 the two alternative courses of study were thrown open to women accordingly. It appears that this arrangement is still adhered to, as at the last anniversary meeting of the College we find four lady students in the first or senior University department, and seven others who are qualifying for the "Medical Practitioner's certificate of the College." It is pleasant to find that in October 1884 Mrs. Scharlieb, M.B., B.S. Lond., was appointed lecturer on Midwifery and Diseases of Women to the

[1] It is of interest to record that one of these ladies was Mrs. Scharlieb, who, after passing through the Medical College at Madras, came subsequently to London, and took her degree as M.B., B.S., with such great distinction at the University of London.

women's class in this University, where she herself began her studies.[1]

Still more recently, steps have been taken to establish a hospital in Madras "for caste and gosha women" under Mrs. Scharlieb's charge. A very influential meeting for the purpose was called on March 6th, 1885, under the presidency of Mrs. Grant Duff, wife of the Governor of Madras; and before the close of the meeting about £8000 had been subscribed for the purpose, half this sum being given by the Raja of Venkatagiri, and £2500 by the Maharaja of Vizianagram.[2] A month or two later, Mrs. Grant Duff received intimation that Her Majesty was "warmly interested in the success of the proposed scheme, and permitted it to be called the Victoria Hospital."[3] On December 7th, 1885, the Hospital was opened in a temporary building by Mrs. Grant Duff, and it was announced that more than £10,000 had already been subscribed.[4] Mrs. Scharlieb has been fortunate enough to secure another graduate of the University of London, Miss Pailthorpe, M.B., as junior medical officer.

The Government of Bombay does not seem to have been as active on behalf of its female subjects as that at Madras, but in January 1883 a very remarkable movement in this direction was initiated by a number

[1] *Journal of National Indian Association*, October 1885.
[2] *Ibid.* May 1885. [3] *Ibid.* July 1885.
[4] *Madras Mail*, December 8, 1885.

of native gentlemen, of whom Mr. Sorabjee Bengallee was hon. secretary and treasurer. They called a meeting of subscribers on March 29th, 1883, Sir Jamsitjee Jejeebhoy in the chair, and announced that about £4000 had already been raised, for the fourfold purpose of (1) bringing out women doctors from England; (2) establishing a dispensary to be worked by them; and (3) a hospital for women and children; and also (4) arranging for the medical education of women at the Bombay Medical College, with scholarships as required.

In pursuance of their object, the committee requested Dr. Edith Pechey to accept the chief appointment in the proposed dispensary and hospital, with a liberal salary, good residence, and the assistance of a junior medical officer, besides facilities for private practice. They were fortunate enough to succeed in inducing Dr. Pechey to accept their offer, and in November 1883 she sailed for Bombay; where she has already obtained a large private practice in addition to her official duties. It was shortly afterwards announced that a native Parsee, Mr. Pestonjee Cama, had given £12,000 for the erection of a hospital; and before Dr. Pechey landed at Bombay, the foundation-stone of this hospital was laid, on November 22nd, 1883, with great *éclat*, by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, who remarked that—

"The introduction of female medical practitioners into India is calculated to afford a needful relief to classes which have hitherto been

almost entirely deprived of medical and surgical aid. I am glad to know that the Governments of the Indian Presidencies are encouraging and assisting this movement, and that the Government of Bombay have promised to place both this Hospital and a Dispensary in connection with it under the sole charge of female practitioners as soon as qualified ladies shall be available for the purpose. It affords me much gratification that my first public act in India should be performed on behalf of so excellent an object, one which Her Majesty the Empress will most highly approve of, and which is in accordance with the sympathies of the Royal Family. I wish the Hospital, of which I have now to lay the foundation-stone, an enduring and extending career of usefulness." [1]

It will be seen that this event marked a new departure in the history of medical women; and also opened a vista of hope and progress to the female natives of India, who may soon swell the ranks, not only of patients, but of practitioners, and learn themthemselves to minister to their own suffering countrywomen. In January, 1884, the Grant Medical College in Bombay was opened to women, and seven women (of whom three were Parsees, and four Europeans or Eurasians) were at once admitted. For nearly ten years the University of Madras had given facilities for medical study by women; and the enlightened action of the Government of Bengal had more recently ensured the admission of women to the Calcutta Medical College, in spite of the shortsighted opposition of certain medical professors. It is extremely satisfactory to know that, as soon as the requisite permission was given, a native lady enrolled herself as a medical student at Calcutta. Indeed, the part taken by the natives themselves is the most

[1] *Daily News*, Dec. 20, 1883.

hopeful feature in the whole history. Had medical women been appointed and salaried by an English society, and sent out to India to practise their profession, some excellent results would no doubt have been obtained; but it is infinitely more satisfactory to find that, in the present case, the whole initiative was taken by native residents, the funds collected by and from them, the arrangements made by them, and the selection and appointment of medical officers made by their representative, duly deputed for the purpose, without the aid or intervention of any European agency whatever.

The very great demand for medical women in Bombay may be estimated from the fact that before the first week had elapsed after the opening of the Dispensary[1] the "daily crowd asking for admission must have numbered over 300. It was therefore necessary to restrict the number each morning to 100," until the arrival of the junior medical officer, Dr. Charlotte Ellaby (a graduate of Paris), in October 1884. The whole number of new patients admitted in the first five months was 2817.[2]

Still more recently, the Countess of Dufferin, wife of the Viceroy, has taken up the matter in the most energetic manner, and has organized an Association, of which the Queen is patron, for the purpose of

[1] The Jaffir Suliman Dispensary was opened in a temporary structure, erected by the liberality of Mr. Hadjee Suliman, on July 7th, 1884.

[2] *First Annual Report of the Medical Women for India Fund*, Bombay 1885.

"supplying female medical aid to the women of India." Lady Dufferin states that this Association may be said to owe its existence to the direct initiative of Her Majesty, who personally commended the matter to Lady Dufferin's attention before she left for India. The prospectus of the Association was issued at Simla, August 18th, 1885, and in the first five months of its existence it received contributions to the amount of nearly three lakhs, or (nominally) £30,000. A very influential meeting in support of its funds was held at the Mansion House, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor, on October 20th, 1885. Branches are being rapidly formed in all parts of India, and arrangements are in progress for the supply of qualified women doctors from Europe, and also for the education of native women as doctors, midwives, and nurses.[1] Under such auspices there is no doubt of the rapidity and thoroughness with which the work is likely to be accomplished.

Those interested in the matter should read an extremely valuable article[2] in which Lady Dufferin herself gives an account of her scheme, and of the success it attained in the first six months. She remarks that "a few persons maintain that the women of this country (India) do see medical men professionally. In reply to this, I think I may

[1] *First Annual Report of the National Association for supplying Female Medical Aid to the Women of India*, Calcutta 1886.

[2] *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, April 1886.

safely say that *they never do except in the last extremity*, and that the doctor so admitted to a zenana enters with his head in a bag, or remains outside the purdah feeling his patient's pulse, but unable to make any of the necessary examinations." One of the most remarkable features of Lady Dufferin's movement is its rigidly non-proselytizing character. Its promoters are, she says, bound in honour never to use the large sums of money confided to them by native gentlemen in any way hostile to the national creeds. This principle makes it, of course, impossible that the new Association should in any degree avail itself of the facilities already created in some places in connection with medical missions; though, at the same time, Lady Dufferin bears cordial testimony to the self-sacrificing spirit and excellent work of many of these missionary organizations. But though the first steps are in this way rendered more difficult, it is easy to see what a much larger field of usefulness will ultimately be thrown open by this wise resolution, as thousands will gladly avail themselves of medical aid *per se*, when they would not introduce a proselytizing agency into their homes.

In fact the demand is evidently already very large, for Lady Dufferin says that "the only difficulty in placing many of the medical women at once is the terrible question of money." I am afraid that she may very shortly find that as regards English medical women, at least, there is a still more terrible difficulty,

viz. that the very small number at present available will go but very little way towards supplying the large demand anticipated. Those who have read the preceding pages know with what enormous effort even the present small results have been attained, and it must be years yet before anything like an adequate number of medical women can be made ready in this country. In the meantime there is, however, the much larger American field to fall back upon; and it is to be hoped that every year will see more native women trained in India to supply the national demand. It is extremely interesting to learn within the last few weeks that a Brahmin lady, named Ananda Joshee Bai, has been for the last three years studying at the Medical College at Philadelphia, and has just taken her M.D. degree.[1] When she returns to her native land her powers of usefulness can hardly be exaggerated.

My time and space will not allow me to say very much respecting the numbers and position of medical women in Continental Europe. I have already mentioned that the University of France was opened to women on the application of Miss Putnam in 1868. Since that period twenty-nine women have obtained the degree of M.D. from the Paris Faculty, and one from that of Montpellier. Of these thirty women, ten were English or Scotch,[2] seven French, three

[1] *Pall Mall Gazette*, April 2, 1886.

[2] See *Note RR.*

American, eight Russian, one German, and one Roumanian. No less than 107 women are at this moment inscribed at Paris as *en cours d'études*, but it is understood that a few of these have died or withdrawn without completing their studies.

I understand that the seven Frenchwomen who have taken the degree of M.D. are all now in practice in Paris, viz. Mesdames Brès, Ribard, Verneuil, Perée, Guénot, Benoit, and Berline. Madame Ribard has, moreover, been commissioned by the Government to examine into the present condition of eyesight in the Ecoles Maternelles, with a view to the arrest of ophthalmia.[1]

With regard to the University of Zurich, I have already stated that Nadejda Suslowa was the first woman who obtained a degree in Medicine in 1867. I have only been able to obtain a list of the women graduates in Medicine up to Easter 1883. At this date I find that twenty-three women had taken the M.D. degree, of whom four were English or Scotch, five Americans, seven Russians, and seven of various Swiss, German, or Austrian nationalities.

I am indebted to the kindness of the Dean of the Medical Faculty at Bern for particulars down to the present date of the graduation of women at that University. It appears that the first woman who took a medical degree at Bern was Rosalie Simonowitsch, a Russian lady, in 1874. Since that time

[1] *Englishwoman's Review*, January 1886.

no less than fifty-five other women have received the M.D. degree, of whom seven are English or Scotch, thirty-nine are Russians, two Frenchwomen, one American, and the remaining six are Swiss or German.

At Geneva also 63 women are now studying in the University, of whom 9 are medical students.[1]

I have not been able to obtain exact particulars respecting the Italian Universities, but they have, as I said previously, *never* been closed to women. Very recently, Queen Margherita, Queen of Italy, took the initiative in throwing open Court appointments to women, Signorina Terne, M.D., being gazetted as one of her Physicians in Ordinary in December 1885.[2]

If now we turn to America, we find that medical women are numbered not by tens, but by hundreds, and that their practice, both among private patients and in hospitals, is of the most extensive kind.[3] In 1881 no less than 470 women were known to have taken medical degrees (exclusive of graduates of

[1] *Englishwoman's Review*, March 1886.

[2] *Englishwoman's Review*, January 1886.

[3] Most of the information that follows is derived from two very valuable papers, written respectively by an American medical man, and by three American medical women, viz. (1) *The Study and Practice of Medicine by Women*, by James R. Chadwick, M.D., published in the *International Review*, October 1879; (2) *The Practice of Medicine by Women in the United States*, by Dr. Emma Call and Drs. Emily and Augusta Pope; a paper read before the American Social Science Association, September 7th, 1881.

eclectic and homœopathic schools), and, in reply to circulars of enquiry, rather more than 300 full answers were received, and some information obtained about 130 more. "Of these 430 women, 390 are found to be engaged in active practice, 11 have never practised at all, while 29 have practised for a time and then retired. Of the latter, 12 have ceased practice on account of marriage, 7 from ill-health, 5 have engaged in other work, while the remainder give no reasons. These women are scattered over twenty-six States of the Union, New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts having the largest number. There are, so far as we know, no women physicians in the Southern States, with the exception of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Texas; also none in Arkansas, Kentucky, and Nevada. While Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago have each quite a large number, many of the answers have come from small villages and towns. Seventy-five per cent. were single on beginning the study of medicine, 19 per cent. were married, and 6 per cent. were widows. Their average age was twenty-seven years, and the average time of study before engaging in practice was four and a half years."

From 362 replies to enquiries respecting the financial results of practice, it appeared that 226 were satisfied with their position, and that most of the remainder had been in practice too short a time to give a definite answer. Only 11 out of the 362 seem

to have practised over two years and to have failed to become self-supporting.

Beside their work in private practice, thirty-four per cent. of this list of physicians are or have been employed as attending or resident physicians in various institutions. The most distinctive work of women in this direction has been the founding and management of hospitals and dispensaries for women and children in several of the large cities.

"The first of these hospitals was chartered in New York in 1857, under the name of 'The New York Infirmary for Women and Children,' with Drs. Elizabeth and Emily Blackwell and Marie E. Zakrzewska as physicians. This hospital now contains thirty beds, and its staff numbers six attending, and eight dispensary, physicians. In 1859, Dr. Zakrzewska was invited by the trustees of the 'New England Female Medical College' to come to Boston and establish a similar hospital in connection with that institution. This she did; but, in 1862 she severed her connection with the college, and became the head physician of the present 'New England Hospital for Women and Children.' In 1861, a similar hospital was begun in Philadelphia, in connection with the 'Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania.' This hospital now consists of thirty-five beds, and its staff numbers five hospital, nine dispensary, and nine district physicians. In 1865, a hospital was established in Chicago, chiefly by the exertions of Dr.

Mary H. Thompson. Its present staff consists of three hospital and six dispensary physicians. The above hospitals are all connected more or less intimately with the various women's medical colleges; and each receives every year from 200 to 400 patients, a large proportion of them being cases of gynœcological surgery and obstetrics. Each has a dispensary connected with it, with departments for in and out patients. The Dispensary of the New York Infirmary had 5151 patients in 1885, and that of the Women's Hospital of Philadelphia 3737. Several other hospitals and dispensaries of smaller size have been established in other cities, as San Francisco, Detroit, Jersey City, and other places."

The New England Hospital of Boston, incorporated in 1862, is the only woman's hospital of any size not connected with a college. It consists of a general hospital of forty-six beds, and a maternity department of twelve beds. The latter was, for many years, the only lying-in hospital in Boston. The hospital staff numbers twelve attending physicians and surgeons, all women. Six "internes," chosen from the women-graduates in Medicine all over the country, are constantly employed there. During 1885 no less than 4523 new patients were admitted to the Dispensary, with a total of 12,296 visits. Besides these, 1265 patients were attended at their homes, and 439 treated in the Hospital itself.

Another field of work, which is just opening for

women physicians, is the care of female patients in insane asylums. The need of women in such asylums has been ably advocated by some of the best physicians of both sexes. In several States, viz. Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Iowa, and Michigan, women physicians have lately received appointments in the State asylums.

With regard to education, we find that the principal separate schools for women are the Female Medical College of Philadelphia, opened in 1850, and the Women's Medical College of the New York Infirmary, opened in 1868. Women are also admitted to some of the State Universities, though not, as yet, to those of oldest foundation, such as Harvard and Yale.

The Department of Medicine and Surgery of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor was opened in 1851. Women have been admitted since 1871 to separate courses, except in chemistry, but under the same requirements as men. It has a session of nine months and a graded course of three years. The number of female students has increased from eighteen in 1871 to forty-two in 1879. In the years 1871 to 1878 eighty women graduated, and in 1884 thirteen women took their degrees. The number of male students ranges from three to five hundred.

The Syracuse University in the State of New York was incorporated on March 25th, 1870, making from the outset no distinction with regard to the sex of the

students. There graduated in Medicine in 1875 three women and ten men; in 1876, three women and sixteen men; in 1877, two women and six men; in 1878, three women and fourteen men; in 1879, no women and six men. The President writes that the absence of women from among the graduates of 1879 was "a mere accident."

The University of California, at Berkeley, a suburb of San Francisco, was organized in 1868, and opened for instruction in 1869. Attendance at three full courses of five months is required before graduation in Medicine, the studies being graded. Women are admitted on an equality with men,—the number of all students in each class being but ten or fifteen, of whom two or three are women. The Pacific Dispensary for Women and Children in San Francisco was incorporated in 1875, and is in successful operation, under the management of three female physicians.

It is very interesting to learn from Dr. Chadwick that in New England, as elsewhere, during the colonial times, much of the medical practice was in the hands of women, who, however, had for the most part little scientific training. The former prevalence of a belief that women were the proper and only qualified custodians of their own sex in child-bearing, is made evident by a town record printed in the first volume of the Collections of the Maine Historical Society. The General Court, held at Wells on the 6th of July 1646, "presented Francis Rayus

for presuming to act the part of midwife. The delinquent, examined by the Court, is fined fifty shillings for his offence; and, paying the fees, five shillings, is discharged."

In conclusion, Dr. Chadwick draws the following inferences among others:—"That there is a wide-spread and ever-growing movement in all parts of the world in favour of allowing women to study and practise medicine. . . . That the extent and force of the demand for the medical education of women in the several countries is in direct ratio to the general enlightenment of the people, finding its loudest expression in England, and notably in America."

And so I have, I think, brought my story to an end. No one can be more conscious than myself of the many defects and deficiencies of my narrative; but the literature of the subject has grown so enormously during the last few years, that my great difficulty has been, not in finding material to insert, but in deciding what may be most harmlessly omitted; and if I have succeeded in rousing some interest in the question, and in giving a fairly connected history of its progress, I shall be only too glad if this little volume may be the means of drawing attention to the much larger stores of information to which I have constantly referred.

In conclusion, I should like to say a word as to aims and objects which I trust that medical women,

now that they have obtained "leave to toil," will stedfastly set before them, and in no words of my own can I do this so well as by quoting the concluding passages from Dr. Edith Pechey's inaugural address to which I have already referred.

"In beginning any undertaking, we naturally look forward and hope for success. But to different minds success conveys various meanings. What meaning have you attached to it? What success are you looking forward to? Is it that of a large practice with a large income? Well, that is one kind of success, certainly, and what the world understands when it speaks of a 'successful physician.' It is an end, too, which I fancy is not very difficult of attainment. The medical profession holds out no great prizes, certainly, in the way of appointments, least of all to women; still there is a constant need of intelligent practitioners, and, so far as I can judge, an increasing desire and need for properly-qualified women. So that any of you, working steadily with this end in view, might very probably find yourselves at the end of ten or twelve years in possession of a large and lucrative practice. But is that not rather a low form of success? Would it not be better to aim at something higher, even at the risk of failure?

'For we know
How far high failure overleaps the bound
Of low successes.'

"I would rather believe that you are all animated

with the desire of leaving the world better and richer and wiser for your presence in it; and that, looking round upon the domain of medical science, and perceiving how, in spite of the immense strides of late years, our knowledge is infinitesimal in comparison of our ignorance, you will each one set to work to clear up, if may be, some of the mists with which that ignorance enshrouds us, that you will endeavour to carry the light of truth into dark places, and to do what in you lies, in however humble and small a way, to further the prevention and cure of disease. Sydenham, in the preface to his writings, says, 'But how great soever others' endeavours have been, I always thought I liv'd in vain, unless I, being of the same employment, contributed something, how small soever, to the Treasury of Physick.'[1] Animated by such feelings, he so busied himself in his calling, that he was enabled to leave us those wonderfully graphic descriptions of the various epidemics of his time which form an epoch in the history of medicine; and the modern appreciation of his labours to promote the art of healing is testified by the existence of the Society which bears his name, by whose means the most valuable additions to foreign medical literature are made intelligible to English-speaking nations. Beginning with such a modest estimate of his own powers, but with such a high aim, he gave an impetus

[1] Sydenham's Works. Translation by John Pechey, tenth edition, 1734.

to the study of medicine which is felt even to the present day, and which may well urge us to look to him as an example for our imitation. Following the same aim, we may be pretty confident that we, too, shall not have lived in vain.

"A reviewer once said of Thackeray, that the highest aim and desire he had for his readers was conveyed in the words, 'Be each, pray God, a gentleman!' To my mind, a very high and noble desire; nor do I see that I can, in conclusion, take leave of you more appropriately than with a similar wish, 'Be each, pray God, a gentlewoman!' There is no profession which calls more urgently than does that of medicine for the exercise of those qualities summed up in the words, gentleman, gentlewoman. — Gentleness towards the weak, forbearance towards those whom sickness and trouble have made forgetful of the little courtesies of life, that genuine self-respect which is not always standing upon its own dignity, infinite patience with the young and the ignorant, a willingness to confess yourself in the dark or in the wrong,— all these virtues should characterize your conduct towards your patients. And to your brothers and sisters in the profession, I trust you will always show that consideration for another's feelings which we owe to all our fellows with whom we may come in contact, and that temperance and courtesy towards those who may differ from you in opinion (however firmly convinced you may be of their error), which

comes from an honest endeavour to look fairly at both sides of a question, and without which discussion becomes useless, and controversy sinks from the platform of argument to the low level of invective."

I venture to hope that there are few women, students or practitioners of medicine, who will not find their hearts re-echo the keynote so nobly struck, and in such response will lie, I am sure, the best augury for the present and future of medical women.

APPENDIX.

A BRIEF SUMMARY

OF THE

ACTION OF DECLARATOR

BROUGHT BY

TEN MATRICULATED LADY STUDENTS

AGAINST THE

SENATUS OF EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY,

1872-73.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. Narrative,	3
2. Conclusions of Summons,	6
3. Case for the Pursuers,	8
4. Case for the Defenders,	14
5. Judgment by the Lord Ordinary,	19
6. Judgments by other Lords of Session,—	
(a) in favour of the defenders,	27
(b) in favour of the pursuers,	34

1.—NARRATIVE.

In 1869 five ladies applied for permission to matriculate in the University of Edinburgh as medical students, and, after discussions and consultations extending over several months, this permission was ultimately accorded with the successive consent of every governing body in the University, viz., the Medical Faculty, the Senatus, the University Court, the General Council, and the Chancellor. The regulations quoted at p. 6. were at the same time passed. After two years of study, during which no complaint whatever was made against the lady students by any of the University authorities, it was found that the ladies could no longer continue their studies unless provision were made to enable them to do so. The University Court forbade their admission to the ordinary lectures, and a majority of the medical professors refused to hold separate classes for their benefit, and also refused to take means for authorizing any one else to do so in their place. The University authorities declined to take any steps to extricate the ladies from this dilemma, and then proceeded for the first time to question their legal right to graduation. After repeated applications to the Senatus and University Court, in which nearly a year was lost, the ladies decided, in conformity with an opinion delivered by the Lord Advocate of Scotland and Sheriff Fraser, to bring an Action of Declarator against the Senatus. This was done in March 1872, and the case was, in July 1872, decided by the Lord Ordinary (Gifford) substantially in favour of the ladies' claims. He affirmed the right of the ladies to complete their studies, subject only to the regulations of the University Court, and also affirmed their absolute right to graduation when their

studies should be completed. But he disallowed the petitory conclusions of the summons on the ground that the Senatus alone was not able to take the measures necessary for the completion of the ladies' education, and, as the University Court was not included in the present summons, no judgment could be given that would involve their action. Practically, however, under this judgment the ladies' legal rights were asserted, and it would only have been necessary to bring a supplementary action against the other University authorities in order to obtain all that was desired. The Lord Ordinary also found the Senatus Academicus liable for three-fourths of the law expenses incurred by the ladies in this action. Against this decision the Senatus appealed to the Inner House, and, after deliberations extending over nearly a year, judgment was, in June 1873, given against the ladies by seven of the Judges, while five decided in their favour. The whole expenses of both sides have by this decision been thrown on the lady students. It should be noticed that the Lord Justice-General gave no judgment, (as he felt himself precluded from doing so, by his position as Chancellor of the University,) but that the Lord Justice-Clerk and the remaining Judges of the First Division all decided in favour of the ladies' claims. The adverse judgment of the majority was based mainly on the opinion that the University Court had, in 1869, done an illegal thing in admitting ladies to the University at all, and on this ground the authorities were held excused from all responsibility towards the ladies themselves. The Lord Justice-Clerk (who was himself Rector of the University in 1869 when the ladies were admitted) denies the justice of this view, and expresses himself on the point in

terms which can hardly fail to commend themselves to the public good sense. In simple fact, the ladies have lost their lawsuit, and, with it, all the labour and all the pecuniary outlay of the past four years, and have also to bear the superadded burden of the expenses of both sides in this action, for the single offence of having trusted implicitly to the good faith and legal knowledge of the University of Edinburgh. They asked for admission to the University; that admission was granted by the concurrent action of all the authorities; it now appears that, instead of accepting the boon offered, and conforming themselves in every respect to the regulations laid down, they ought rather to have accused the University of ignorance of its own legal powers, and required security that after receiving their fees for four years, the authorities would not repudiate all corresponding obligations. It is for the public to judge how far such a course would have been more prudent and more commendable than that which they actually followed, and for which they have been so bitterly punished.

In the following sketch the briefest possible abstract is given of the arguments on both sides (which were printed for the convenience of the Court of Session), and of the judgments pronounced by the several judges, that of the Lord Justice-Clerk (Moncreiff) alone being given almost at full length.

The judgments of the Lords Ordinary and of the Lords of the First Division are extracted *verbatim* from their own papers, printed by order of the Court. The judgments of the Lords of the Second Division are extracted from the *Scotsman* of June 28th, 1873.

2.—SUMMONS.

Declaratory Conclusions.

It Ought and Should be Found and Declared, by decree of the Lords of our Council and Session, (1.) that the pursuers are entitled to attend the classes of any of the Professors of the University of Edinburgh, and to receive instruction from the Professors in said University, upon making due payment of all fees exigible from students at the University for said instruction; (2.) that the pursuers are entitled to receive such instruction in the University as is required to qualify for graduation in medicine; (3.) that, on compliance with the regulations of the University as to attendance on classes and otherwise, preliminary to examination for degrees, the pursuers are entitled to proceed to the examination for degrees in manner prescribed by the regulations of the University; (4.) that the defenders, the Senatus Academicus, are bound to provide such instruction as aforesaid to the pursuers, and thereafter to admit them to examination as candidates for medical degrees, and, on their being found qualified, to recommend them to the Chancellor of the University for having such degrees conferred upon them; (5.) that the defender, the said Right Honourable John Inglis, as Chancellor of the said University, is bound, upon such recommendation being made by the Senatus Academicus, to confer such a degree upon any of the pursuers found qualified and so recommended.

Petitory Conclusions.

And the defenders, constituting the said Senatus Academicus, Ought and Should be Decerned and

Ordained to make regulations whereby the pursuers shall receive instruction in the University of Edinburgh, as is required to qualify for graduation in medicine, and, in particular, that they should direct and appoint the various professors, whose duty it is to give instruction in medicine, to permit the attendance of the pursuers upon their classes along with male students; or otherways to direct and order the professors, whose duty it is to give instruction in medicine, to teach the pursuers and any other women who may constitute themselves into a class separate and apart from male students, the pursuers always making payment of the proper fees for matriculation, and to the professors of such instruction as aforesaid; and the defenders, constituting the said Senatus Academicus, Ought to be Decerned and Ordained to admit the pursuers to examination as candidates for medical degrees, and, on their being found qualified, to recommend them to the Chancellor of the University for having such degrees conferred upon them; and the defender the said Right Honourable John Inglis, as Chancellor of the University, Ought to be Decerned and Ordained, by decree foresaid, upon receiving such recommendation from the Senatus Academicus, to confer degrees upon the pursuers; and, in the event of any of the defenders appearing to oppose the conclusions of this action, then the defenders so appearing Ought and Should be Decerned and Ordained to make payment to the pursuers of the sum of £500, more or less, as the expenses of the process to follow hereon, conform to the law and daily practice of Scotland used and observed in the like cases, as is alleged.

3.—ABSTRACT OF CASE FOR THE LADY STUDENTS (*Pursuers*).

The pursuers are ten matriculated students of the University of Edinburgh, who have been at successive periods admitted to the study of medicine in the University, in conformity with the regulations enacted in 1869, and subsequently published every year in the official calendar. In the early part of 1869 one of their number applied for admission, but the request was at the time refused on account of the difficulty of carrying out "temporary arrangements in the interest of one lady." A few months later, four other ladies came forward, and a subsequent request was made, that the University would "sanction the matriculation of women as medical students, and their admission to the usual examinations," it being specially mentioned that the said examinations were desired "with a view to obtain medical degrees in due course." After repeated consultations between the different bodies concerned in the governance of the University, the following regulations were formally enacted, and received the sanction of the Chancellor on November 12th, 1869 :—

"1. Women shall be admitted to the study of Medicine in the University."

"2. The instruction of women for the profession of Medicine shall be conducted in separate classes, confined entirely to women."

"3. The Professors of the Faculty of Medicine shall, for this purpose, be permitted to have separate classes for women."

"4. Women not intending to study Medicine professionally may be admitted to such of these classes, or to such part of the courses of instruction given in such classes as the University Court may from time to time think fit and approve."

"5. The fee for the full course of instruction, in such classes, shall be Four Guineas; but in the event of the number of students proposing to attend any such class being too small to provide a reasonable remuneration at that rate, it shall be in the power of the Professor to make arrangements for a higher fee, subject to the usual sanction of the University Court."

"6. All women attending such classes shall be subject to all the regulations, now or at any future time in force in the University, as to the matriculation of students, their attendance on classes, examination or otherwise."

"7. The above Regulations shall take effect as from the commencement of session 1869-70."

These regulations were communicated to the lady students for their guidance, and strict compliance with them on their part has been required during the past four years, no doubt as to the validity of the regulations being ever raised, until after the commencement of the present action.

The pursuers have every year been required to pay the ordinary matriculation fee. Their names are inscribed in the University album indiscriminately with those of other students, and they have received the ordinary matriculation tickets, declaring them to be "Cives Academiæ Edinensis." They have submitted, and are willing to submit, to all the University regulations, and to pay whatever fees may be required of them. "But because the pursuers are women, the defenders refuse to teach them, or to make regulations" for so doing, and thus the pursuers are deprived of the means of completing their education. The Medical Act of 1858 makes no distinction between male and female practitioners, but it requires that all shall have passed the examinations of certain specified Boards, after study

at a regular medical school. If, therefore, the pursuers are prevented from complying with the requirements of the Act, they will be practically shut out of the Medical Profession, contrary to the intention and purpose of the legislature; and this although many of them are already entered as registered students of medicine in the Register kept by order of the Branch Medical Council for Scotland.

The pursuers were formally admitted to the University with the consent of all the authorities, and in reliance on their good faith; yet the Medical Professors will make no arrangements for teaching them, and the Senatus and University Court alike refuse to compel them to do so, or to authorise any alternative measures, though, in several ways (specified in detail), the desired object might be attained.

The constitution of the Scottish Universities presents nothing incompatible with the right of women to matriculate and graduate; and the practice of the University of Bologna affords many precedents for such admission.

In the Bull of foundation of the University of Glasgow in 1450 its teachers and students are specially endowed with all the privileges and rights belonging to the older University of Bologna, on the model of which it was mainly established. The University of Edinburgh had a similar constitution to that of Glasgow; and in 1621, an Act of Parliament confirmed to Edinburgh all the liberties and privileges appertaining to any free college in the kingdom.

In the original Charters of the Edinburgh University, no words are used which in any way exclude women, and the negative fact that no women were

admitted as students before 1869 depends on the corresponding fact, that no women had ever applied for admission.

The argument that women cannot be graduates, because, as such, they would acquire a right to the franchise, which is expressly denied them by the Courts of Law, could only be paralleled by the argument that women cannot be householders, because the householder is theoretically invested with the same right.

The usage of foreign Universities is largely in favour of the admission of women. The particulars are given at great length, but there is not room to reproduce them here. The Italian Universities have always been open to women, as is shown by official documents obtained by one of the pursuers from Bologna, Padua, and elsewhere ; several women having even held Chairs in such Universities. At Bologna alone there have been seven women professors, three of them being in the Medical Faculty. Among the records of the University of Padua is a temporary regulation against the granting of degrees to women, which appears to have been later rescinded, and which clearly proves that at the time of its enactment (1533) it was not uncommon for women to attend the University. Official communications from the Ministries of Public Instruction in France and Italy are brought forward to show that in both these countries University honours are now as free to women as to men. Numerous women have recently received degrees from the University of France, and a still larger number are now studying at Zurich. The University of Michigan is expressly stated to be "endowed primarily for the education of the sons and daughters of the State."

The fact that women have never applied for admission to Scottish Universities before the present century is to a great extent explained by the wild and unsettled state of the country at the time when its Universities were founded, by the condition of women then, and by the great danger to which they would have been exposed in travelling to University towns. There really exists no precedent on which a case like the present can be decided.

The University Court of Edinburgh seems to have been strictly within its rights when it admitted women, for, by the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1858, the Court is expressly empowered "To effect improvements in the internal arrangements of the University, after due communication with the Senatus Academicus, and with the sanction of the Chancellor; provided that all such proposed improvements shall be submitted to the University Council for their consideration." All these provisions were duly complied with in this case.

The Regulations issued by that Court point plainly to the education of women "*for the profession of Medicine*," and to their "*examination*," and, consequently, to their graduation. If, therefore, the Court were acting within their powers, and if by such action they admitted women to the position of matriculated students, it is plain that such women have a right to claim the full privileges of studentship, and, consequently, to demand the means of education, and, when fully qualified, the regular medical degree.

"In conclusion, the pursuers may remark that they are willing to accept the defenders' statement that the power to confer degrees is one of the Regalia, and is simply delegated to a University on the ground that

such a body is best qualified for '*discovering who shall be the worthy recipients*' of the honours in question. But the pursuers contend that the 'worthiness' of the aspirants for degrees is the only point which the Universities are empowered to determine, and that they are in fact bound, as a condition of the power entrusted to them, to afford equal opportunities and facilities to all applicants, and to make the necessary investigation without favour or prejudice to any, it being entirely beyond their competency arbitrarily to exclude from such honours one half of her Majesty's subjects, without due inquiry into their several merits and attainments. The pursuers are convinced that, up to the present time, the value attached to University degrees has depended on the general belief of the public that merit is the sole condition required in the recipients, and that the honours in question are open to all who are able to reach the appointed standard. They beg to submit that nothing could be more fatal to the future status of those holding University degrees than a decision by your Lordships that these honours are not any longer to be considered as the reward of literary and scientific attainments *per se*, but as a mere appanage of the male sex, respecting which that sex is protected from the competition of women, not by virtue of superior merit or learning, as tested by competent tribunals, but by a legal decision excluding all women, whatever their qualifications, from appearing before such tribunals. They feel confidence, therefore, in urging their present suit, not merely with a view to their own advantage, but in the interests of the Universities themselves, and of the community at large."

4.—ABSTRACT OF CASE FOR THE SENATUS ACADEMICUS (*Defenders*).

The claim of the pursuers comprises all the privileges of studentship, including the right to graduation, and, should they be successful in their claim, women would henceforth stand on the same footing as men with regard to all University privileges. The question of the expediency of the practice of medicine by women is not the point at issue; the right to practise might be obtained without the aid of a University, by the intervention of the Crown or the Legislature. What is really involved is a change in the uniform practice of Scotch Universities since their foundation. The claim to graduation includes, and may be held as the measure of, all other claims. "Now a University degree is by no means a mere private mark of proficiency; it is, on the contrary, a public title, conferring public status, recognised in courts of law, and it flows directly from the Crown, as in former times from the Emperors, or from the Popes as the spiritual heads of all Europe. Doubtless, when we speak of the honours which flow from the Crown, we are accustomed to think rather of those honours which come directly from that source, as Knighthoods, Baronetcies, and Peerages; still there is no doubt whatever that in point of law, University degrees stand exactly upon the same footing. In practice, of course, the Crown cannot confer University degrees or any literary honours, in the same way as it confers the above distinctions. The Crown cannot have the materials on which it could proceed in conferring such literary honours; and, therefore, with regard to these latter, the Crown delegates to others the power of

discovering who shall be the worthy recipients of the same. Hence it has been the habit of the Crown to delegate to certain learned bodies, namely, the Universities of the kingdom, the power of making this investigation, and of conferring these honours; but that power is not less one of the Regalia—it not less confers, as has been above stated, a public and legal status—and it not less confers a right which the law recognises; and any attempt to interfere with which the law will prevent."

The power of conferring degrees must be expressly conferred by the Crown, and in the original charter of 1582 no such power is conferred on the Edinburgh University, though degrees were practically granted from 1587 onwards. In 1621 a new Act was passed, which may be held to give the power of granting degrees among other privileges conferred, "in als ample forme and lairge manner as any colledge hes or bruikes within this His Majestie's realme;" or, if this is not the case, the granting of degrees has, down to 1858, been merely a usurped right. In the latter case, "the use of a usurped right must be the measure of it, and the exercise cannot be extended beyond the usage,"—*i.e.*, cannot be made to include women who have never previously benefited by it. If the right to graduate students depends on the Act of 1621, it is measured by that already enjoyed by the other Scotch Universities. The purpose of the University of St Andrews is thus described :—"Ut viros producat consillii maturitate "conspicuos, virtutem redimitos ornatibus, ac diver- "sarum facultatum dogmatibus eruditos, sitque ibi fons "scientiarum irriguus, de cujus plenitudine hauriant "universi, liberalibus cupientes imbui documentis, non

" solum incolæ civitatis prædictæ, sed etiam circumpo-
" sitæ regionis."

The word " vir " clearly excludes women, and the discipline and mode of life enjoined imply the presence of men only. Custom has always been in strict accordance with the above view; no women have ever been admitted into a Scotch University. The University of Bologna can only be quoted as a doubtful authority in a question of precedent, and as a matter of fact the defenders find no provision for the admission of women in the Statutes of Bologna, the masculine gender being always used. They have great doubts whether women were ever admitted to study at Bologna in the ordinary way, though distinctions were occasionally conferred in special cases *honoris causâ*. " Because an Italian university has on rare occasions gone beyond its statutory rights, therefore our Scotch universities are to be compelled to adopt a wholly novel system, at variance both with their statutes and their unvarying custom." The defenders deny that the action of the present University of France is of any value as a precedent, for this so-called University is " nothing more than the National Board of Education in France. It is not the University which confers the degree at all, it is the Minister of State." As regards the University of Zurich, women are admitted, not as a matter of right, but as a questionable experiment.

Even if women had any original right to enter the Universities, it is not of the nature of a *res meræ facultatis*, which may lie dormant indefinitely, and then be capriciously claimed. " It is a right of a kind which, even if it were originally possessed, can be forfeited by non-usage." But the defenders maintain that the

custom of British Universities shows that women never had the right at all. If no right of admission is explicitly given in the charters, custom must be taken to interpret that omission. The right of women to the franchise was rejected on the ground "that custom had so interpreted the words of the statutes as to show that the franchise had never been given to women." Should the pursuers succeed in establishing their right to graduation, they would, as graduates, be entitled to the franchise. "The two judgments would be direct contradictors one of the other. Women shall not have the franchise, *because* custom is against them: they shall be members of the University General Council, and so get the franchise, *although* custom is against them."

The University of London needed a special charter to enable it even to give "Certificates of Proficiency" to women; much more would such a supplementary charter be required in order to confer on them degrees.

With reference to the steps taken by the University of Edinburgh in 1869, the defenders maintain that only an experiment was contemplated, and that only permission for partial instruction was given, with no view to graduation; the professors being permitted, but in no way bound, to teach the pursuers. They further maintain that if anything more was contemplated, the University Court went beyond its powers, and its regulations are incompetent and *ultra vires*. The Senatus had no intention to confer the right to graduation, and had no reason to think that the pursuers proposed to insist on it. The fact of matriculation is one of no moment; the fee demanded is merely for the support of the library. It was not till 1871 that the

pursuers indicated that they considered themselves entitled to graduation. The Senatus could not compel the professors to teach separate classes, nor to admit women to their ordinary lectures.

It is doubtful whether it was not illegal even to admit women to University instruction, but it is clear that the University had no right to "usurp a royal prerogative by conferring degrees on women."

The Lord Ordinary has already dismissed the petitory conclusions, as involving matters beyond the control of the Senatus. The Court of Session is never in the habit of "granting declarators of abstract right, without clearly apprehending how the right is to be made good," and therefore, if the petitory conclusions cannot be enforced, the declaratory conclusions ought also to be dismissed. "The defenders do not at all dispute that the Crown could settle the whole matter, perhaps by altering the University laws; certainly by granting a new charter either to this or some other university. The present argument merely is, that there cannot be a University right which the University cannot make available, and that the fact that the authority of the Crown must be invoked in order to carry out the particular right which is claimed in this action, is conclusive to shew that, as a matter of University law, the right does not exist according to the present University constitution."

———

5.—JUDGMENT OF THE LORD ORDINARY.

Edinburgh, 27th July 1872.—The Lord Ordinary having heard parties' procurators, and having considered the closed record, statutes, charters, and writs founded on, and whole process: Repels the first plea in law stated for the defenders, the Senatus Academicus of the University of Edinburgh, that all parties are not called: Finds that the resolutions or regulations passed and enacted by the University Court of the University of Edinburgh, dated 10th November 1869, and approved of by the Chancellor of the said University, of date 12th November 1869, form part of the regulations now in force in the University of Edinburgh, and must receive effect as such: Finds that according to the existing constitution and regulations of the said University of Edinburgh, the pursuers are entitled to be admitted to the study of medicine in the said University, and that they are entitled to all the rights and privileges of lawful students in the said University, subject only to the conditions specified and contained in the said regulations of 12th November 1869: Finds that the pursuers, on completing the prescribed studies, and on compliance with all the existing regulations of the University preliminary to degrees, are entitled to proceed to examination for degrees in manner prescribed by the regulations of the University of Edinburgh: Finds that the defenders, the Senatus Academicus of the said University, are bound, on the pursuers completing the prescribed studies, and complying with said regulations, to admit the pursuers to examination as candidates for medical degrees, and on the pursuers being found qualified, to recommend them to the

Chancellor of the University for having such degrees conferred upon them; and finds that the defender, the Right Hon. John Inglis, as Chancellor of the said University, is bound, upon such recommendation being made by the Senatus Academicus, to confer medical degrees upon any or upon all of the pursuers who are found qualified therefor, and recommended as aforesaid: And in terms of the above findings, and to the effect thereof, finds, decerns, and declares under the declaratory conclusions of the summons: Farther decerns and ordains the defenders, the Senatus Academicus, on the pursuers respectively completing the prescribed studies and complying with the existing regulations of the University preliminary to degrees, to admit the pursuers to examination as candidates for medical degrees, and on the pursuers being found qualified decerns and ordains the said Senatus Academicus to recommend the pursuers to the Chancellor of the said University for having such degrees conferred upon them, and decerns and ordains the defender, the said Right Hon. John Inglis, as Chancellor of the said University, on receiving the requisite recommendation from the Senatus Academicus, to confer upon the pursuers respectively the medical degrees for which they are recommended. *Quoad ultra* dismisses the remaining conclusions of the action, excepting the conclusion for expenses. Decerns: Finds the defenders, the said Senatus Academicus, liable to the pursuers in expenses, subject to modification; and, in the circumstances, modifies the same by deducting one-fourth from the taxed amount. Remits the account of said expenses, when lodged, to the auditor of the Court to tax the same, and to report, and reserves all

questions of relief as between the minority and majority of the Senatus Academicus: Finds no other expenses due in the cause, and decerns.

(Signed) Ad. Gifford.

Extracts from Note appended to the Lord Ordinary's Judgment.

The importance of the question to the present pursuers and to all ladies who, like them, may contemplate the practice of medicine as a profession, lies in this, that, by the provisions of the "Medical Act" of 1858, no one is entitled to be registered as a medical practitioner without possessing a medical degree from one or other of the universities of the United Kingdom, or a licence equivalent thereto from certain established medical bodies mentioned in the Act. A foreign or colonial degree is not available, and does not entitle to registration unless the holder thereof has been in practice in Great Britain previous to October 1858. Unless the pursuers, therefore, succeed in obtaining degrees, they will be practically excluded from the profession of medicine, for they are not in a position to demand licences from any of the authorised medical bodies, and it can scarcely be expected that they will prosecute their medical studies merely in order to be hereafter classed with empirics, herbalists, or medical botanists, or with those who, in common language, are denominated quacks. Without legal registration under the Medical Act of 1858, the pursuers would be denied all right to recover fees; they would be incapable of holding any medical appointment; and they would be subject to very serious penalties if they so much as attempted to assume the name or title of medical practitioners.

The only parties called as defenders are (1) Senatus Academicus of the University and the professors as individual members of the said Senatus, and (2) the Right Hon. John Inglis, the Lord Justice-General of Scotland, as Chancellor of the University. The University of Edinburgh itself, as a corporate body, is not called as a defender, and is not a party to the present proceedings. Neither are any of the governing bodies of the University, excepting the Senatus. Neither the University Court nor the University Council are parties to the action. This peculiarity in the action led to the first plea in law for the Senatus, that "all parties are not called;" and this is the first question of which the Lord Ordinary should dispose. . . The Lord Ordinary has repelled the plea that other parties are not called. But then it follows from the principle upon which this preliminary plea has been repelled, that there is in the present action to be no attempt to impugn in the slightest degree the existing constitution of the University. None of its existing regulations or ordinances are to be

challenged as illegal or *ultra vires*—the pursuers are not to seek to extend or alter any of its laws, but are only to ask that these laws, exactly as they stand, shall be enforced and applied. In short, everything connected with the existing constitution of the University is to be taken as right, and the Senatus are simply called upon to carry out that constitution, and to give effect to laws and regulations already enacted. . .

I. It was broadly maintained by the counsel for the Senatus, in a very powerful and able speech, that the University of Edinburgh was founded, and existed, as an educational institute for male students exclusively—that none but males were entitled to be admitted or matriculate as students ; that males alone were entitled to become members of the University, or to receive instruction therein ; and that the privileges and rights of graduation were reserved for males alone. If this proposition be well founded, there is of course an end of the whole case. The Lord Ordinary, however, has felt himself quite unable to affirm this proposition, but has come ultimately, without any hesitation at all, to the conclusion that there is no foundation for this first and general contention of the defenders.

(1.) The charter of the University gave no countenance to the supposition that women were, in all circumstances, to be excluded from its benefits. The rights, liberties, and privileges conferred upon the University are all expressed in the most general terms, and are all quite consistent with provision being made for the instruction of females as well as of males within the walls of the University and by its professors duly appointed. (2.) . . It seems sufficiently shown that the Universities of Scotland were, to a great extent, constituted upon the model of Bologna and similar institutions in Italy ; and it seems a quite fair observation, and one entitled to considerable weight, that as women were never excluded from the Italian Universities, it cannot have been intended originally to exclude them from those founded in Scotland. (3.) Much stress was laid by the counsel for the Senatus upon the past history and practice of the University of Edinburgh, and upon the fact that there is no recorded instance of a woman having ever taken a degree therein. It is impossible to deny that this argument has some weight, perhaps considerable weight, but the Lord Ordinary thinks it will not bear the stress which the defenders lay upon it. At least the practice is merely negative. There is no instance of a woman ever having been excluded or refused admission or instruction. If women had originally right to become students or graduates, their right will not be lost by mere non-usage, that is, by their merely neglecting to use their right. The right in them was one *meræ facultatis*, like a man's right to build upon his own ground —a right which will not be lost though no building should be erected for hundreds or thousands of years. To extinguish such a right there must be a contrary usage—a possession inconsistent with the exercise of the right—and this does not exist in the present case. (4.) If there is no express exclusion of women, and nothing necessarily leading to their exclusion, it seems fair to fall back upon the inherent legality and appropriateness of the study and practice of medicine for women, and to infer

that a medical school founded in the University cannot have as one of its conditions the exclusion of the female sex. (5.) But passing from such general considerations, the Lord Ordinary thinks it quite conclusive of the whole question that, by regulations lawfully enacted by competent and sufficient authority, provision is actually and expressly made for the admission of women to the study of medicine in the University of Edinburgh, and actually detailed regulations have been enacted regulating their studies and examinations. These regulations will be immediately adverted to, as they form a leading, and, in the Lord Ordinary's view, a conclusive feature in the pursuers' case, and they are only noticed here as absolutely and utterly putting an end to the defenders' contention that the University of Edinburgh is a University for males only. The first words of the regulations are—"Women shall be admitted to the study of medicine in the University." . .

The Lord Ordinary holds, therefore, that the defenders have entirely failed in their attempt to show that the University of Edinburgh is restricted to males exclusively.

II. The Lord Ordinary is of opinion that the "regulations for the education of women in medicine in the University" of Edinburgh, enacted by the University Court of 10th November 1869, and approved of by the Chancellor on 12th November 1869, are valid and binding in every respect, and form an integral part of the constitution and regulations of the University as it at present exists. At the debate it was felt on both sides that these regulations formed almost the turning-point in the case, and the counsel for the Senatus, sorely pressed by them, boldly challenged their legality, maintained that they were *ultra vires* of the University Court to enact, and he asked the Lord Ordinary to treat them as a nullity. Here, again, the Lord Ordinary thinks that the position taken by the Senatus is absolutely untenable.

The regulations in question were solemnly, after much discussion, after long consideration, and after due communication with the whole governing bodies of the University, enacted by the University Court. Under the Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858, the University Court has, under certain safeguards, very large and almost legislative powers. . .

Nothing can well be broader than the power so conferred. The very care with which safeguards are provided shows the extent of the authority. . .

These regulations were enacted with all the required statutory requisites. "Due communication" was had with the Senatus. The matter was submitted to and deliberately considered by the University Council, and the regulations received the final sanction and approval of the Chancellor. The Senatus, the University Council, and the University Court had all the benefit of the very highest legal skill and experience. Most eminent lawyers were members of all these bodies; and the Chancellor, who put the seal of his approbation and sanction to the regulations, holds with universal acceptance the very highest judicial office in Scotland. . . Still further, the Lord Ordinary is of opinion that the validity and binding character of these regulations cannot be impugned or challenged in the

present action. No reduction of the regulations has been instituted. They have never been said to be illegal or invalid till this was maintained for the first time in the present argument, and the Senatus itself, as well as everybody else, has hitherto admitted their validity, and acted upon them. So satisfied have the Senatus been of the validity of the regulations, that they have actually applied to the enacting power—that is, to the University Court—to rescind them; but saving the rights of those who have acted upon them, the attempt failed. The University Court refused to rescind the regulations, and they still stand part of the law of the University. As has been already pointed out, neither the University itself, nor the University Court, nor the University Council, are parties to the present action, and it is quite clear that the Lord Ordinary cannot, without calling and hearing all these parties, even entertain a motion virtually to reduce and set aside part of their laws. A declarator of nullity of part of the University regulations will require to be brought in a very different way, and with very different parties from the present action.

In short, the Lord Ordinary thinks that, looking to the form of the present action and the parties thereto, he must hold that the ratified and confirmed regulations of 10th November 1869 are in all respects valid and integral parts of the University constitution, and all that he has to do is to apply and carry them out according to their true meaning and import. . .

The first article of the regulations is in these words—"Women shall be admitted to the study of medicine in the University." The Lord Ordinary cannot read this otherwise than as entitling the pursuers to be admitted as students—members of the University with the full privileges of students, subject only to the conditions specified in the regulations.

It was strongly contended for the Senatus that women were not entitled to matriculation, and that there was a distinction between admission to study and matriculation as a student. The Lord Ordinary has failed to see any substance in the distinction, and indeed he regards this dispute as little more than a difference about words. The reality of the thing—and this is far more important than the name—undoubtedly is that women are to be admitted as students in the University, whatever be the form in which this is done. In point of fact, all the pursuers have matriculated repeatedly, and they all hold tickets as "*Cives Academiæ Edinensis.*" Now, if students of the University, the Lord Ordinary thinks that the pursuers must have all the privileges of students, subject only to the special conditions under which they were admitted relative to the separate classes. The Lord Ordinary cannot assent to the doctrine maintained by the Senatus that the pursuers were only students by permission, and not students as matter of right. It is impossible to hold that ladies are students with no rights whatever, whereas males are students with legal and enforceable rights. The University has no power to make such a distinction, and, what is of equal importance, it has never attempted to do so. It follows that the pursuers are entitled to attend all necessary classes, provided only they can be taught separately. To admit them as students

and yet deny their right to be taught, would be absurd. The provision about separate teaching may create a difficulty, but this is a mere difficulty in details, which, in the Lord Ordinary's view, ought to be easily and at once surmounted. And lastly, it follows that the pursuers, on completing their studies and complying with all existing regulations, are entitled, as a matter of right, to demand examination, and if found qualified, are entitled, equally as a matter of right, to demand full and complete medical degrees. The right to medical graduation is really at the foundation of the whole of the present dispute. If the ladies would be content to study as mere amateurs—as mere *dilettanti*—it rather appears that no question would ever have been raised. . The right to demand graduation is a necessary consequence of the right to study at the University : ordinary medical degrees are not matters of mere favour or of arbitrary discretion. They are the indefeasible right of the successful student—the fitting termination and "crown" of his completed study. The idea that there may be some students who may study, and study successfully, but who may not graduate, was never heard of before the present controversy arose, and yet in high quarters a doubt upon this point seems to have arisen. . . The Lord Ordinary is of opinion, without any doubt at all, that the proposal to withhold from successful or fully accomplished female students the regular degrees, and to give them instead mere certificates of proficiency, is incompetent, as well as unjust. The proposal is not unnaturally stigmatised by the present pursuers as a "mere mockery," and the Lord Ordinary thinks it can only have arisen from an entire misconception of the legal rights of an admitted student of the University. The right to demand a regular degree is, and always must be, an integral part of the right of every lawful student who is found duly qualified, and who complies with the prescribed conditions. . .

But while the Lord Ordinary has in substance affirmed the declaratory conclusions of the summons, he has found himself obliged to negative the leading petitory conclusions. The first petitory conclusion is to ordain the defenders, the Senatus, to make regulations whereby the pursuers shall receive such instruction in the University as is required for graduation in medicine, "and, in particular, that they should direct and appoint the various professors whose duty it is to give instruction in medicine to permit the attendance of the pursuers upon their classes along with male students." The Lord Ordinary can find no sufficient grounds for pronouncing any such decree, and there are conclusive reasons why no such decree should be pronounced. The defenders, the Senatus, have no power to make such regulations. The University Court, and not the Senatus—at least the University Court ultimately—is the body by whom such regulations fall to be made. Neither the University itself, nor the University Court, are parties to the present action. Before the pursuers can obtain an order upon the Senatus, they must show that the Senatus have power to do the thing to which they are to be compelled. This has not been shown, and, the Lord Ordinary thinks, cannot be shown. . .

The Lord Ordinary has only to express, in concluding these observa-

tions, his earnest hope and belief that the judgment in the present action, whether affirmed or reversed, will terminate the unfortunate controversy which has raged so long. On the one hand, if the judgment is affirmed, and the right of the pursuers to study, and, on being found qualified, to obtain degrees, is finally fixed, it surely cannot be doubted that the Senatus, the University Court, and the University Council will do whatever is necessary to enable the ladies to complete their course of study. At present there seems too much ground for the remark that by the regulations these ladies have been induced to enter upon their duties, and have been most unfairly stopped in mid-career. It seems to the Lord Ordinary that this has arisen from a misconception—a quite honest misconception—as to the pursuers' right to obtain degrees. If this misconception is removed, the Senatus and all the officials of the University will undoubtedly gladly continue to fulfil the honourable understanding on which the pursuers were induced to commence their studies. There is really no practical difficulty in doing so. If not the Senatus, at least the University Court, has undoubted power to recognise extra-academical teachers, whose courses will be reckoned sufficient for the purposes of graduation. Teachers of unquestionable standing and ability are ready to give the pursuers the instruction in separate classes which state of health or want of time prevents the professors in the University from imparting. It is apparent from the correspondence referred to on record that this would have been done had not the doubt arisen whether the ladies were entitled to demand degrees, and whether medical degrees could be lawfully conferred upon them. That doubt the Lord Ordinary, by the present judgment, has endeavoured to dispel.

On the other hand, if the present judgment is reversed, and if it be finally fixed that by the law of Scotland, a woman cannot be a legal student at the University of Edinburgh and cannot legally obtain a degree there, though on the other side, the whole controversy will equally be settled. The ladies will only have to deplore that they have been misled by the most authoritative-looking regulations of 10th November 1869, and to seek their remedy against the existing law from some new legislative enactment.

As the pursuers have been practically successful, the Lord Ordinary has awarded them expenses, but only against the Senatus, not against the Chancellor. These expenses, however, are subject to modification, because the pursuers have failed in making good very important petitory conclusions.

6.—JUDGMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE DEFENDERS.

(1.) *By* Lord Cowan (*Second Division*).

Lord Cowan could not hold it to be doubtful that by the original charter and Parliamentary ratification in 1621, and the other documents forming the foundation of the University, the institution was framed on the footing of providing for the education of male students alone; and that any doubt suggested as to the true effect and meaning of those constitutional documents, because of the non-express exclusion of females, had been removed by the usage that had followed for three centuries. . . Being an institute for male students, and actually regulated and managed accordingly, it formed an inherent part of its constitution that females could not be admitted to its benefits, and a radical change in it by the Legislature or the Crown was necessary before the admission of females as students could have been, or could be, sanctioned by the University authorities. . . He believed that the University Court exceeded its statutory power in recognising by those regulations the right of females to matriculate with the view of examination and graduation. . . Then the admitted inability to give practical operation to the regulations by judicial decree might be fairly enough viewed as a conclusive test in the present inquiry. . . An operative decree could not be pronounced, and thus it was a purely innocuous declaratory judgment which was suggested as fitting in the circumstances to be pronounced. It appeared to him quite inadmissible, both in form and in principle, so to deal with such an action as the present. . . He was of opinion that the defences stated to the action should be sustained.

(2.) *By* Lord Benholme (*Second Division*).

The main and most important question which the Court had to determine in this case was whether women were entitled to matriculate and to obtain their education in the University of Edinburgh, just as if they were males. Whether women, if duly qualified, were incapable of holding degrees, or of receiving academical honours, were totally different, and, in his opinion, altogether subordinate questions. . . He thought it was clear, from the original constitution of the college, from the documents on which that constitution stood, and still more from the immemorial practice, that it was not within the constitution of the University. With regard to the second point, whether the Act of Parliament of 1858 was intended to enlarge the constitution, or to permit the University authorities to do so, he had as little doubt. He thought that those authorities had altogether mistaken the meaning and effect of the Act when they supposed—and to a certain extent acted upon the supposition—that they were entitled, under the expression of "internal regulations," so to alter, and, as he considered, to overthrow the constitution of the University.

(3.) *By* Lord Neaves (*Second Division*).

Lord Neaves was of opinion that the interlocutor under review (Lord Gifford's) ought to be recalled, and that the defenders ought to be assoilzied from the whole conclusions of the action. He was of opinion that the Universities of Scotland were instituted and maintained for the special and exclusive purpose of conferring the benefits of the higher education upon male

students without the necessity of their resorting for that purpose to foreign countries. . . From the year 1411 to about 1860, a period of 450 years, there was no instance producible of a woman having been educated at any Scottish University. He need not dwell on the legal importance of that fact. He did not think that any satisfactory or even plausible answer had been made to it. The attempt at an answer consisted in this, that the resort to a University was merely optional, which was called in law *res meræ facultatis*—a mere privilege which the party entitled to it might enforce or not as he pleased, and which could not be lost *non intendendo*, and the case was put of an abstinence from University study by Roman Catholics, Jews, Indians, or Negroes. It was asked, "Can it be said that the University could not, by vote and resolution, have admitted these persons?" In his view of the matter, no vote or resolution would be needed for such persons; they would be admitted as a matter of course, because no legal principle could be assigned for excluding them. . . The law did recognise the difference of sex as an established and well-known element, leading sometimes to the exemption, and sometimes to the absolute exclusion, of women from a variety of duties, privileges, and powers. . . Much time might or ought to be given by women to the acquisition of a knowledge of household affairs and family duties, as well as to those ornamental parts of education which tended so much to social refinement and domestic happiness; and the study necessary for mastering these must always form a serious distraction from severer pursuits, while there was little doubt that in public estimation the want of these feminine arts and

attractions in a woman would be ill supplied by such branches of knowledge as a University could bestow. Lord Neaves then dilated in a way which elicited much laughter in court on the possible inconveniences that might arise from joint study in Universities by young men and women, and concluded by saying that if the pursuers had any grievance, it should be remedied by an amendment of the Medical Act of 1858.

(4.) *By* Lord Ormidale (*Ordinary.*)

"The only question which the Court has to determine is, whether by law women do, or do not, possess the rights and privileges claimed for them in the present action. . . Having regard to what has been the long, uniform, and uninterrupted usage, not only of the Edinburgh but of all the other Scottish Universities since their establishment centuries ago, it cannot well be questioned, I think, that it must hitherto also have been the general understanding of the country that women had not the right of admission as students at any of them. And if so, the presumption against the existence of any such right, or that it ever was intended to be, or was ever in point of fact, conferred on women, seems irresistible. . . I can entertain no doubt that women are not entitled by and under the constitution of the Edinburgh University, as it existed prior to the regulations immediately to be noticed, to the rights and privileges claimed by the pursuers. It is maintained, however, and is apparently relied upon by the Lord Ordinary as the chief support of his judgment, that the right of women to be educated for the medical profession, in the University of Edinburgh, has been established, if it did not previously exist, by the regulations of the

University Court of 10th November 1869. . . It is, indeed, an important and very serious question whether these regulations were within the competency of the governing bodies of the University, all, or any of them, to enact, and whether they can be recognised as having any effect at all. The University Court, by whom they were enacted, could have had no power to do so except under the Universities Act of 1858. . . It appears to me to be very clear that this neither warranted nor contemplated any alteration of the previously existing constitution of the University. . . If, therefore, it is to be held, as, I think, for the reasons already stated, it must, that by the fundamental constitution of the University of Edinburgh, as it stood prior to and under the Act of 1868, women were not admissible as students, or had the other rights and privileges claimed by the pursuers, and that it were necessary to challenge the validity and binding nature of the regulations in question as going beyond the constitution of the University, and as being *ultra vires* of the University Court to enact, I should think that this could be done, and may be held to have been effectually done by the defenders. . . Be this, however, as it may, these regulations, when closely examined, will be found to be of little or no efficacy. Most assuredly they create and impose no obligation or duty either on the Senatus or the Chancellor, who are the only defenders called in this action. . . I have only further to remark that, if the pursuers have failed, as I think they have, to support their claims consistently with the constitution of the University, whether considered in connection with the regulations of the 10th of October 1869, or independently of these regulations, it is unnecessary to inquire whether

any other, and what, remedies are open to them. I may, however, be permitted to remark that if it be desirable, and for the interests of the country—and I do not say it may not—that women should receive University education to qualify them as medical practitioners, it rather appears to me that it is for the Crown or Legislature, and not this Court, to determine upon what footing, and under what arrangements, this should be done. For the reasons I have now stated, I am of opinion that the interlocutor under review is erroneous; that it ought to be recalled; and that the defenders are entitled to absolvitor from the present action as laid."

(5.) *By* Lord Mure (*Ordinary*).

Lord Mure considers the principal question to be "whether, according to the law and constitution of the University of Edinburgh, women are entitled, upon payment of the matriculation and other fees, to attend the classes of any of the professors, and are entitled to demand from the professors the instruction which is necessary to the obtaining of degrees, and which the professors are bound to give them. . . I have, without much difficulty, arrived at the conclusion that this demand of the pursuers to be admitted, as matter of legal right, to the full privileges of students of the University of Edinburgh, is not well founded. . . When the foundation deeds of the University of Edinburgh are construed and read in the light of the uniform and uninterrupted usage which has followed upon them, they appear to me to be conclusive against the claim now made by the pursuers." . . With regard to the regulations of 1869, Lord Mure considers that they are

either insufficient to support the conclusions of this action, or else, that if otherwise interpreted, they were beyond the power of the University Court to enact.

(6 & 7.) *By* Lords Mackenzie & Shand (*Ordinaries*).

In order to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion upon this question, it seems to be necessary to consider, *first*, what the rights of women are, according to the law and constitution of the University of Edinburgh, independently of the Regulations passed on 10th November 1869 by the University Court, for the education of women in medicine in the University ; and *second*, whether, by these Regulations, any rights were conferred upon women which can support the pursuers' claims. . . We are of opinion that women are not entitled by the law and constitution of the University of Edinburgh, as the same existed in 1869, before the Regulations of the University Court were passed, to attend the classes of the professors, or to receive instruction within the University as students, or to obtain University degrees. . . We are of opinion that the University Court was by these Regulations (limited as their extent, in our opinion, is) going beyond their legitimate province of effecting an improvement in the internal arrangements of the University, which was alone within its statutory power, and was proposing to make a fundamental change upon that law and constitution, and accordingly that these Regulations are *ultra vires* and illegal. The University was founded by Royal authority, and by Royal authority alone can its constitution be altered and extended."

JUDGMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE PURSUERS.

(1) *By* Lord Deas (*First Division.*)

"In the way this case has been pleaded by the parties, the first important question arising for consideration is, whether females are entitled, as matter of legal right, without the necessity of any express sanction from the authorities of the University, to become students at the University, and to obtain, on the same conditions with male students, such honours and degrees as the University can confer? If the fact that, in the order of nature, no superiority, moral or intellectual, can be attributed to the one sex over the other, were pertinent to the present question, I should at once answer that question in the affirmative. The development of the moral and intellectual faculties is no doubt moulded and varied by sex; and this variation contributes largely to the happiness of the human race. But, balancing what is most to be esteemed in the one sex against what is most to be esteemed in the other, the scales cannot well be said to preponderate on either side, or, at least, not on the side of the male sex. Nor can I doubt that there are at all times such a number of females who would profit by such studies as are pursued at Universities, as to make it desirable that means of prosecuting these studies should, as far as practicable, be available to them. But the present question is altogether different. It is true that, in the Charters and Acts of Parliament which form the written constitution of the University of Edinburgh, there is no express exclusion of females from the privileges of the University. But, at the same time, it is clear enough that, down to the date of the recent regulations quoted in the Record, all the arrangements as to teaching and graduation in the University proceeded on the footing that the students were all male

students, and, until one or more of the present pursuers came forward, no female seems ever to have proposed to become a student in that University. That, I think, is of itself conclusive against now giving effect to the pursuers' claim as matter of pure legal right. . . My opinion, therefore, is, that, except in so far as this action seeks to vindicate the rights of the pursuers as recognised in the regulations of 1869, no effect can be given to the conclusions of the action, either declaratory or petitory. But this leads to the second, and not less important question, whether the enactment of the regulations of 1869 was within the power or competency of the authorities of the University? . . My opinion is, that the regulations were not *ultra vires*. There was nothing in the terms of the written constitution of the University to exclude females. If females had applied at the outset, they might or might not have been admitted, according to the views taken of the expediency or propriety of admitting them. But I fail to see that there would have been any illegality or incompetency in admitting them. The purpose of the institution was the education of the human mind,—a purpose applicable equally to males and females. . . There still remains a third question: What are the rights of the individual pursuers under the existing regulations? To that question I answer, that the pursuers are entitled to receive instruction from those of the medical professors who may arrange to teach them in classes separate from male students; and that if they can thus obtain and produce evidence of having completed the prescribed course of study, and shall successfully undergo the examination prescribed for male students, they will be equally entitled with male students to medical degrees."

(2.) *By* Lord Jerviswoode *(First Division.)*

"I concur, without reservation, in the general course of reasoning of the above Opinion, and in the conclusion at which Lord Deas has there arrived."

(3.) *By* Lord Ardmillan (*First Division*).

"I am of opinion that the decision of this cause must turn, not so much on the more general questions which have been so ably argued, in regard to the origin and history of the Scottish Universities, as on the more immediate and practical question—What is the meaning, the authority, and the effect of the University regulations of 1869? . . The absence of women from the classes of the University, which is a mere matter of fact, is according to long and uniform custom. The exclusion or rejection of women, which implies power to exclude,—power in existence and in exercise,—has no support or authority in custom. If the University had rejected the claim, it may be that the uniform custom would have been viewed as supporting the rejection. But we shall see that this was not the case; for in regard to these pursuers there has been no rejection. . . I do not think that, in the absence of University regulation, and in opposition to long and uniform custom, women are entitled to demand and enforce admission as students into the medical classes of the University with a view to graduation, merely because of any essential suitableness in their practice of medicine, or any inherent lawfulness and propriety in their claim. On the other hand, I do not think that their claim for admission to such study and such graduation is essentially and necessarily so inappropriate, unreason-

able, and illegal, as to be beyond the reach of University regulation. There is nothing to prevent the rejection of the claim, or to prevent the concession of the claim, by the University. . . Application for the first time, and therefore contrary to uniform custom, may be supposed to have been, at different periods of our history, made by a Roman Catholic, or by a Jew, or by an Indian, or a Negro. Can it be said that the University could not, by vote and resolution, have admitted these persons? But the argument for exclusion in respect of custom alone, implies that all these persons must have been inexorably shut out, and that the University could not have admitted them. I am not able to arrive at that conclusion. I therefore proceed to consider the import and effect of the regulations by the University Court in 1869; and I do not pause to comment on any of the objections which have been taken in point of form to these regulations. None of the technical objections which have been urged by the defenders are, in my opinion, well founded. . . I cannot doubt that, according to these regulations, the pursuers are entitled to admission to the study of medicine,—certainly not in mixed classes along with men, but in such separate classes as can be arranged with the professors of medicine. I am further of opinion that, under these regulations, women are entitled to matriculation as students, as I understand they have in point of fact matriculated, and that they also are entitled to be admitted to examination with a view to the medical profession; for that end or object qualifies the whole claim made, and the whole arrangements sanctioned. . . I am of opinion that women, being entitled to enter on such study, and to

be admitted to examination with the view to the medical profession, are, on the completion of their studies, on their complying with all the conditions imposed by law, and on passing their examination, and being found duly qualified, also entitled to demand and obtain the usual medical degrees. . . I agree with the Lord Ordinary in holding that graduation is "the indefeasable right of the successful student,—the fitting termination and crown of completed study." To admit the pursuers to the study of medicine with a view to the profession of medicine, and to admit them to the testing of that study by examination, and then to refuse them graduation if duly qualified, would be to mock them, after encouraging them to hope and stimulating them to effort. It would truly be to lead them into a delusion and a snare. . . I think that the Lord Ordinary has judged rightly in confining his Interlocutor to the declaratory conclusions. I confess I do not see my way at present to go further."

(4.) *By* Lord Gifford (*Ordinary*).

"After fully reconsidering the whole case, with the benefit of the written argument which has been submitted, I adhere substantially to the views expressed in the Note which I appended to the Interlocutor now under review."

(5.) *By* The Lord Justice-Clerk (Moncreiff).

The Lord Justice-Clerk (after the delivery of all the other opinions) said that "as he was a member of the University Court during the period to which part of the proceedings referred, he should gladly have been re-

lieved of the duty of judging in this case. But as their Lordships had not thought that circumstance sufficient to excuse the discharge of his judicial duty, he should shortly state the opinion which he had formed of the case. . . Whether it was desirable that women should study medicine or any other science in our Universities, whether their study there should be in separate classes, or whether it was expedient for themselves or the University, or the other students, that they should be so admitted, were questions which the Court had no occasion and no qualification to decide. On matters such as these, depending on no juridical principle or practice, but on sentiment, on academical experience, and social expediency, their individual views were merely units, hardly appreciable in the sum of public opinion. The question of expediency, as far as this case was concerned, had been settled for the Court by the only competent authority. On the merits of this action, his Lordship's opinion coincided with that of Lord Deas and the other consulted judges who adhered to him. . . He thought this was a question of purely academical administration, and that it should be relegated to that department, from which it was unfortunate for all parties that it had been removed. He was anxious in the outset to bring the case back from the wide and discursive dissertations by which it had been adorned and obscured, to the true questions raised in this summons. It was an action which had for its scope and limit to define and enforce the duty of the Senatus and the Chancellor of the University towards the pursuers, as matriculated students, in the matters raised in the summons. No decree which could be pronounced in the action could go beyond that, and any

such decree could only affirm an existing and operative duty on the part of the defenders under the existing rules by which their authority was regulated and defined. However wide, therefore, the demands made in this summons might seem to be, they must be read in the light of the position and obligations of the subordinate executive body of the University. This had been brought to an issue by the defenders' plea that all parties were not called, by which they meant that they could not be required to do any act which was not sanctioned by the existing rules of the University, and that the summons raised questions in which their academical superiors were the proper contradictors. The Lord Ordinary, on the ground that no such questions could be raised under the present summons, repelled that plea, and he (the Lord Justice-Clerk) did not understand that it was now proposed to sustain it. . . In the year 1869 the University Court, on the application of the pursuers, or some of them, enacted the regulations quoted in the condescendence. He had no doubt that these regulations, as far as mere form was concerned, were regularly passed. They were passed under the general power which the Court possessed, under certain forms and conditions, to introduce improvements into the University. Under these regulations the pursuers passed the preliminary examination in arts prescribed for medical students, matriculated in the ordinary manner, and received their tickets of matriculation; were registered as students of medicine in the Government register, and finished the first portion of the medical curriculum. Some of them passed the examination in the middle of the curriculum, but at that point their farther progress was arrested by

two elements. The first was that they could not find Professors willing to teach them in separate classes. That difficulty might have been got over had not the Senatus raised the second by intimating very clearly that they intended to resist the admission of any of the pursuers to graduation, and raised doubts whether to do so would not be contrary to law. They ultimately applied to the University Court to rescind the regulations of 1869. Finding the legal question raised, the University Court, who seemed otherwise not to have been indisposed to assist the pursuers, held their hand, and the pursuers accordingly raised this action, which brought up these two practical questions for decision—(1) whether the Professors in the Medical Faculty were bound to teach the pursuers, either in separate or mixed classes, under the regulations existing? and (2) whether the defenders were bound to admit the pursuers to graduation on their complying with the other regulations of the University? He thought there was manifestly no ground on which the first of these conclusions could be supported. The University Court had left it optional to the Professors to teach or not, but prohibited their teaching in any but separate classes. On the second question, his Lordship entertained no doubt whatever. Those regulations had no object and no meaning as regarded those women who intended to follow medicine as a profession, but to enable them to qualify for graduation; nor did their terms admit of any other interpretation. On the faith of these regulations the ladies had incurred the delay and expense of going through a considerable portion of the curriculum. To deny them the degree which was essential to their entering the profession, and with a view to which they

studied, on the pretext—for it was no better—that no such end was ever contemplated, was entirely unjust and unwarranted; and that all the more that all the evils said to be connected with the admission of females to the University attached only to the study which was permitted, while the honour could injure no one, and was only valuable as the passport to the medical profession, with which, as a body, the defenders had no concern. That this question of graduation, from whatever cause, was in reality the sole matter in dispute, was sufficiently evident from the pleading of the defenders themselves. No doubt they devoted a large portion of their argument to prove that women never had been, and never ought to be, admitted to University study; but in the sequel they disclosed with sufficient frankness that if the pursuers would have contented themselves with mere certificates of proficiency, and would have abandoned their claim for graduation, they might possibly have fared better. This alternative implied university study, and, therefore, as graduation was the cardinal point in the case, his opinion was that, on completing the curriculum as matriculated students, the pursuers were entitled by the existing rules of the University to be admitted to graduation, and, indeed, he had found little of argument addressed to prove the contrary. This, in his opinion, was sufficient for the decision of this case. It was, however, maintained by the defenders that the University Court had no power to pass these regulations; they said that by the constitution of the University no woman could be admitted either for study or for graduation, and that the regulations and all that has followed upon them were therefore a mere nullity, and could receive no effect. He thought this answer

entirely irrelevant. Questions might no doubt arise between the superior and subordinate powers in the University as to the legality of the former's orders, and these might legitimately be called in question. But, when a student had entered the University, and had duly conformed to the rules on the faith of which he entered, it would be no defence on the part of the Senatus to his claim to graduate that the rules under which he had been admitted were liable to legal objection. The duty of the Senatus was to obey the *de facto* law of the University, and any other principle would be not only subversive of academical discipline, but would lead to the greatest injustice, as he thought was the case here. The matriculation of the student created an implied contract between him and the University authorities that, if he complied with the existing rules, they would confer the benefits in the hope of which he resorted to the University. They could not, after the student had performed his part of the engagement, refuse to fulfil theirs, on the ground that the contract was made under rules which it was beyond the power of their academical superiors to make. They could not compel the student, as a condition of his graduation, to take upon himself the defence of the laws of the University; his sole duty was to obey them, and if their lawfulness was disputed, that must be done in a question with those who made them, not with the student who trusted to them. The legality of the resolutions was challenged on the ground—(1.) of the original charter of the University; and (2.) of the usage of centuries. The former seemed to him quite unsupported; the latter had some plausibility; but on the best consideration he had been able to give them, both grounds were falla-

cious. On the first question both parties had resorted to extreme propositions. The contention of the pursuers that females were entitled to the same University privileges with males, was, he thought, a hopeless one, against which usage was conclusive. On the other hand, it had surprised him to find it contended in the name of the Senatus that it was a mistake to suppose that, by its original charter, Edinburgh University ever had a legal right to confer degrees on any one, and that the practice to the contrary was probably a mere assumption. They must reduce this controversy within more reasonable limits. From the terms of its foundation, this University, like that of Glasgow and that of Bologna, the prototype of both, was intended for the instruction of the community. He could give no weight to the criticisms, which were failures within their own narrow limits, on the use of masculine nouns and adjectives in these foundations. It would always, even were the pursuers to succeed in all for which they had contended, continue to be the main object for which this and the other universities were founded, to train up worthy men for the service of the State. If the same words of foundation were applied to every public object —an infirmary, a hospital, a public library, an institute of science, of language, of painting, or of music—would they necessarily include one sex only, and exclude the other? Many actual instances of the reverse would occur to every one, in which the joint study of adults of both sexes is not unknown. The important fact in the present case was, that as the University was at present constituted, the regulations were entirely consistent with its practical administration, and had been found by experience to be so. With regard to the argument

drawn from usage, it was sufficiently plain that had there been any usage the other way, this question never could have arisen. That no woman ever had been admitted, or had ever asked to be admitted to graduate in a Scotch University was quite true; but he thought the weight due to that fact was considerably misapprehended. In the first place, before usage could be held to restrict or limit powers which were otherwise general, the usage must be reasonably connected with the limitation. If the Universities never had the opportunity of exercising their power, it was difficult to see how the fact of its never having been exercised could limit the generality of the grant. But it was quite certain that the new application of women to be admitted as students had no connection whatever with the power or want of power of the University to admit them. There was no limitation, he thought, on the University which prevented them from admitting any member of the community, and their power to do that remained now as unrestricted as it was at the first; for if the Universities originally were intended for the benefit of the whole community, then the use of the public right by any of the community preserved it for the rest. But, in like manner, the course and habit of administration might come materially to restrict those who demanded that that course should be altered to suit their views. Persons placed in circumstances which had hitherto prevented their availing themselves of University instruction were not entitled to require the University either to alter these rules to suit their circumstances, or to admit them on conditions prejudicial to the interests and discipline of the great mass of the students. His Lordship attached but little weight to the argument

drawn from the franchise, or to the notion that a University degree implied a public function. As to the first, the distinction was manifest—as wide as that between the education and cultivation of the intellect, and political power. It was the nature of the subject-matter which alone gave pertinency to the allegation of usage in the case of the franchise, which was a public function, from which, from its nature, the presumption was that women were debarred unless there were a specific law to the contrary. The usage was justly held to prove that the general terms of the Act of Parliament could not be regarded as a specific law to the contrary. The presumption in this case was exactly the reverse. Lastly, as to the supposed public nature of a University degree. There was nothing cabalistic or mysterious in a University degree. It was simply an attestation of academical merit. While the analogies drawn from the Continental practice do not greatly aid the general argument, they have sufficiently dispelled the notion that it was the academical law of Europe that a woman could not be a graduate. On the contrary, the European Universities of yore hailed and proclaimed the successes of those of the gentler sex who were thought worthy of the honours of the learned. On the whole, he thought the defenders had failed to prove that graduation was or ever had been held to be, among the great Continental Universities, beyond the ambition of a woman ; or that there existed any solid grounds, even could the question be raised in this action, for questioning the power of the University authorities to pass the regulations in dispute. He differed from his brethren in the case ; but after what the other judges had said, the decision of the Court

must be, of course, to assoilzie the defenders from all the conclusions of the action."

Mr WATSON, on behalf of the Senatus Academicus, asked for expenses.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL, for the ladies, did not think that this was a case in which expenses should be allowed.

The LORD JUSTICE-CLERK, after consulting with his brethren, said they must follow their ordinary rule and grant the motion of the counsel for the Senatus.

NOTES.

—o—

NOTE A, p. 8.

I am very unwilling to alter the words in the text, and I am glad to say that I still do heartily believe that the "motives and conduct of the majority of medical men are altogether above question" with regard to their attendance on women. At the same time I feel obliged to say frankly that, with greater experience, I have come to see more rather than less reason for the attendance of women on women in all the special ailments relating exclusively to their sex, and I am glad to hope that, as medical women increase in number, treatment of this kind will pass more and more completely into their hands. Of course, if there were any reason to believe that women could not be as competent practitioners as men, all other considerations must give way to those of safety, for it is certainly necessary that every sick person should have, so far as possible, the best skill at his or her command, and "*necessitas non habet lex.*" Now, however, that, for the first time within human memory, women are allowed the same opportunities of education and examination as men, and now that I venture to think they have shown themselves fully able to compete with them on equal terms, it is allowable to give weight to other considerations, and especially to those of natural delicacy. I cannot refrain therefore from saying that it seems to me that nothing but habit can blind the public to the incongruity, and indeed I may almost say the indecency, of the custom that expects women of all ranks and all ages to consult practitioners of the other sex, and accept treatment from them for the most delicate and private ailments; and I protest emphatically that no one is entitled to defend such practice (except as a temporary necessity) unless he is also prepared to advocate the attendance of medical women upon patients of the other sex in diseases of every kind and description. We have too long allowed a double standard to be set up in this matter, as in others; either the question of sex must be excluded wholly and entirely from all questions relating to the medical profession,—and our opponents will have to change their whole front of battle before they can adopt this position,—or we must allow that, while science is always pure and impersonal, she yet cannot obliterate distinctions that are co-extensive with human nature, and that any attempt to do so is rather to be deprecated than encouraged. I believe that in cases of urgent need every medical practitioner of either sex ought to be ready to render all medical service to any and every patient, whether of the same sex or the other; but that in the absence of special emergency it is most fitting and most right that the special diseases of each sex should be treated by members of that sex, and by them only. I remember well that in the time of our Edinburgh struggle, a medical student was canvassing for votes hostile to us at the Infirmary Meeting, and that he urged on one old gentleman this argument: "But *you* would not like to be attended by these medical ladies?" "No, sir! but it is just *because* I should not like to be attended by a woman, that I will do my best that women shall not be forced to

submit to the medical attendance of men!" One would think that the retort was obvious enough, but it is wonderful how few people see that an argument cuts two ways.

Of course there is a large field of practice which might properly be considered neutral ground, where no special considerations of sex need enter at all, and, so far as this is concerned, I see no reason why any rigid limit should be drawn on either side. But I do feel bound to say that there is a class of cases, involving diseases peculiar to each sex, where it is at least highly undesirable that men should attend on women, or women on men; and I can testify that women have suffered, and do suffer, acutely when compelled to submit to the attendance of men, and I have known cases of young girls where such suffering has only been forgotten at a cost of modesty and delicacy of feeling that was even far more to be regretted.

With regard to the effect on the medical men I will not venture myself to speak, but indications are not wanting that the most eminent members of the profession are not altogether satisfied with the results produced. At the debate at the Medical Council in 1875, Sir William Gull made this very remarkable statement:—

"I consider there are some parts of the medical profession that a highly-trained woman could do better than a man. There are certain sex relations which might be avoided in that way with great advantage to the public. I need not say that there is a quiet scandal in certain parts of our profession about women's diseases, which will be got rid of by introducing high-minded well-trained women into the practice of Medicine. That is rather an important point."—*Medical Press and Circular*, July 14, 1875.

On the same occasion, also, Professor Humphrey said:—

"Look at the question morally and socially; for perhaps that is after all no light part of it. I think it is not easy to say that the practice of medicine by women upon men is a greater moral evil than the practice of medicine by men upon women. Indeed, I am not sure that it is not altogether unattended by its great moral evils."—*Ibid.*

And again I find the following passage in a letter from a medical man to a daily paper, written in immediate relation to our struggle in Edinburgh:—

"Then again Professor Laycock states that he 'knows from experience that a proportion of the students have prurient thoughts, and are apt to express them.' Some persons are morbidly acute in making discoveries of this kind, the idea is a disagreeable one, and the professor was unhappily inspired in his mode of expression; but supposing it is all true, there is nothing in such thoughts to prevent a successful examination for a medical degree, and these prurient-minded youths will grow up prurient-minded men, to whom, nevertheless, not the lives only, but the reputation, modesty, and honour of our women are confided. The first time these things suggested themselves forcibly to my mind was some years ago. A crowded meeting of the profession was held for the purpose of depriving a medical man of some celebrity of the membership of the Obstetrical Society, on account of malpractices, of a nature too cruel and abominable to allude to here, alleged against him with regard to his female patients. The report of that meeting is contained in the *Lancet*, April 6, 1867, somewhat toned down for publication, as any one who was present will admit. But some of the statements made, and the bursts of laughter—or as the French reporters say, *hilarité*—which were elicited by certain portions of the discussion, created a most painful and disagreeable impression on my mind. I could not help thinking that any woman reading that report would be glad to have at least the choice allowed her of employing one of her own sex as a medical attendant in case she preferred to do so."—*Pall Mall Gazette*, May 11, 1870.

NOTE B, p. 8.

The following are a few only out of many indications of the existence of the painful feeling alluded to in the text. The reader will hardly need to be reminded that this is especially a subject respecting which a maximum

of feeling may well exist with a minimum of expression, for hardly anything but a sense of duty would make a woman write on such a question to the newspapers.

. . . "But there remains to be considered the modesty and delicacy of the patients—a question hardly yet mooted; these poor women having, I suppose, too much of the reality to raise the point. It cannot be denied that at least one-half of the patients of medical men are women, or that usually (from natural causes) they require medical services more certainly and frequently than men; and operations delicate or indelicate, so called, must be performed, questions, delicate or indelicate, must be asked and answered too, if not by the patient herself, by the nurse, who, I believe, is usually a woman.

"There is much reason to believe that many women, either owing to the nature of their malady, or from constitutional nervousness or reserve, never avail themselves of the services of a medical man without reluctance. To them it is always a painful effort—the twentieth time as much as the first. It would, I think, be odd if something of this kind were not felt very strongly by every woman on some occasions, and I have seen very experienced mothers quite distressed, if by any chance they were deprived of the assistance of 'the doctor they were used to.' The wives of medical men have told me that it was their one comfort to feel that in their hour of suffering only their own husband and a good nurse need be with them. I think this is not unnatural."—Letter by "MEDICUS," *Pall Mall Gazette*, May 11, 1870.

"I happened to be speaking to a young shopwoman—a total stranger to me—and in the course of conversation advised her to seek medical advice, when she replied, with a sudden gush of tears in her eyes, that she *had* been in the Infirmary, in Dr Matthews Duncan's ward, for a fortnight, and had during that time suffered so much from the constant presence of crowds of male students during certain inevitable but most unpleasant examinations of her person, that, as she herself forcibly expressed it, 'it almost drove me mad.'"

—*Daily Review*, Nov. 18, 1870.

"SIR,—A new obstacle has been thrown in the way of women acquiring a knowledge of the medical profession. The special obstacle at present is injury to the delicacy of mind of the male students. This delicacy, if real, must be a serious drawback to the proper exercise of their profession in after life. That it is so, many a suffering woman knows.

"The question, however, arises—which evil is the greater,—that five hundred youths, in full health and vigour, should be made a little uncomfortable by the presence of seven women, or that seven times five hundred women, unnerved by suffering, should be subjected to the very trial they shrink from?

"That women do truly shrink from this trial, the number of wretched, broken-down sufferers from chronic disease but too clearly proves. It is only when racked by constant pain that a woman's natural delicacy at last gives way, often only to hear said the words (how bitter they are!) 'too late.'

"The returns of the Registrar-General could also prove the vast sacrifice of life, did delicacy not again step in with 'consumption and liver complaints,' as more euphonious terms for the real disorders of which these are the mere after results.

"This objection, looked at fairly, is a case of the delicacy of five hundred men *versus* that of all suffering women.

"I leave the fathers and husbands of Edinburgh to judge righteous judgment thereon.—I am, &c., A SUFFERER."—*Scotsman*, November, 21, 1870.

"I think most thoughtful women will bear testimony to the amount of preventible suffering that passes unaided, because the natural sensibilities of women prevent their resorting with comfort to treatment by medical men for certain diseases. I can count almost by dozens the cases which have come under my personal observation of health ruined, and life's pleasures and usefulness alike lost with it, because young girls (and sometimes older women too) will not submit to receive from a man, however respected, the personal examination and treatment necessary for their restoration, and because no woman's skill has been at their command. Let your readers divest themselves for a moment of conventional habits of thought, and inquire what would then be their instinctive opinion of the existing custom which compels one sex to be dependent on the other for medical treatment of the most delicate kind. Imagine the case reversed. If henceforth women alone were to attend on men, what would the world say to that? At any rate, is it not time that women should at least be allowed a choice in this matter? And if this be so, it is clear that some women must be thoroughly educated for the medical profession. . . .—I am, &c., A WOMAN."

—*Manchester Examiner and Times*, November 30, 1870.

"Mention is rarely made of the many women who are waiting longingly for the time when it will be possible for them to consult doctors of their own sex—when they will no longer be forced, at the risk of their health, and perhaps life, to consult men in circumstances under which their natural feelings of delicacy revolt; but I am sure that the number

of these is not small, and longsuffering as they have hitherto been, their voice in time will make itself heard, if all other monitions are disregarded.—I am, &c., A WOMAN WHO DESIRES A WOMAN DOCTOR."—*Daily Review*, December 22, 1870.

"We often hear of the possible dislike of male patients to the presence of lady students, but let us also give the weaker sex a little credit for these same much-talked-of feelings of modesty and decency. Many a time have I stood by the bedside of poor girls who seemed ready to sink under the shame of being exposed before a number of young men—a feeling which could not be overcome even by the agony of the operations. . . . A MEDICAL STUDENT."—*Scotsman*, December 26, 1870.

"EDINBURGH, Dec. 28, 1870.

"SIR,—In the present controversy regarding the extension to women of facilities for obtaining a complete medical education, it is reiterated on one side that there is no demand among women themselves for doctors of their own sex. In visiting a district of nine families in a poor quarter of the Old Town, inhabited principally by Irish, I found four women seriously out of health; not so seriously, however, but that they might have been cured by timely medical advice. I urged each of them more than once to go to the Dispensary, but all persistently refused, each of them saying in different words that, if ladies were doctors, as they had heard they were in some places, they would have had medical advice long before. The feelings of these poor women were so strong on the subject that I found it was useless to urge them further. It seems only just and reasonable that qualified female medical attendants should be within the reach of those who either have a strong preference for it, or who will not avail themselves of any other.—I am, &c., A DISTRICT VISITOR."—*Scotsman*, December 29, 1870.

"Selfishness, it has been said, oftener springs from a want of imagination than a want of heart. If we mean selfish conduct this saying is doubtless true. People who are not selfishly disposed, do selfish acts from a want of power to imagine the effect of their actions upon others. They do not mean to injure, but they do it, because they have not a sufficiently lively imagination to put themselves at the point of view of other people. A striking illustration may be found in the attitude so generally taken up by men towards women's hospitals and women doctors. Their imagination is active enough to conjure up the picture of themselves consulting, and being treated by a lady doctor; and according to the maladies they are thinking of the picture is either ludicrous or disgusting. But they altogether lack the power of putting the opposite side of the case, and considering what must be the feelings of women obliged, whatever their ailment, to go to men doctors. They forget that women have the same sense of modesty as themselves, only in a more intense degree; and they fancy that because women are of a different sex, all laws of psychology are suspended. Custom, no doubt, goes a long way to reconcile women to their fate, just as custom would in time blunt the stings of shamefacedness in men; but we forget that every young woman has to go through the ordeal of being shocked over and over again, before she is able to bear her fate with resignation. One must have had a very small experience who does not know, or has not heard, of cases in which a reluctance to consult male physicians has cost young girls much suffering, and sometimes irreparable injury. . . . The cruelty of denying to women the ministry of their own sex is enhanced by the great pains taken to develope their native modesty to the most extreme degree. . . . Society is a remorseless legislator. . . . If one of its victims were to complain that, after inculcating upon her the straitest virtue, and intensifying her modesty to a point of extreme sensibility, it nevertheless subjected her to the wanton cruelty of exposure to men doctors, society would perhaps have the courage to say that that was an immodest complaint."

—*The Examiner*, November 25, 1871.

"As one who, for a short time, was a patient under a late very eminent doctor of Edinburgh, I say that I believe nothing would again induce me to do what I then did, in ignorance of what was before me. The anguish of mind suffered silently by women in such circumstances is not to be described, and is likely seriously to influence the effect of the medical treatment. It is surely time for men to cease to speak of what *women feel* in this matter. It is impossible for them to know what women will never tell them—the unwillingness, the delay, often *too long*, which precedes their stammered request for advice. What women need is, that some of their own sex should have the power of qualifying themselves to act as their advisers. Who has a right to say they shall not, when the voice of their countrywomen calls on them to do it?—I am, &c., AN ENGLISHWOMAN."—*Scotsman*, June 6, 1872.

NOTE C, p. 41.

In answer to the sufficiently arrogant inquiry from Dr. Henry Bennet,—"What right have women to claim mental equality with men?"—I addressed

the following letter to the *Lancet*, and as it seems to me to sum up our position fairly enough, I here reprint it :—

"EDINBURGH, June 21, 1870.

"SIR,—I see in your columns of June 18th a letter on 'Women as Practitioners of Midwifery,' and appeal to your sense of fairness to allow me a fourth part of the space it occupied, for a few words in reply.

"It is hardly worth while to discuss the early part of the letter, as the second paragraph sufficiently disposes of the first. After saying that women are 'sexually, constitutionally, and mentally unfitted for hard and incessant toil,' Dr Bennet goes on to propose to make over to them, as their sole share of the medical profession, what he himself well describes as its 'most arduous, most wearing, and most unremunerative duties.' In the last adjective seems really to lie the whole suitability of the division of labour according to the writer's view. He evidently thinks that women's capabilities are nicely graduated to fit '*half-guinea* or *guinea* midwifery cases,' and that all patients paying a larger sum, of necessity need the superior powers of the '*male* mind of the Caucasian race.' Let whatever is well paid be left to the man, then chivalrously abandon the 'badly remunerated' work to the woman. This is the genuine view of a true trades-unionist. It is well for once to hear it candidly stated. As I trust the majority of medical men would be ashamed of avowing such a principle, and as I am sure it would be indignantly disavowed by the general public, I do not care to say more on this point.

"But when Dr. Bennet proceeds to dogmatize about what he calls our claim to 'mental equality,' he comes to a different and much more important question. I, for one, do not care in the least either to claim or disown such equality, nor do I see that it is at all essential to the real question at issue. Allow me to state in a few words the position that I, and, as I believe, most of my fellow-students take. We say to the authorities of the medical profession, 'State clearly what attainments you consider necessary for a medical practitioner; fix your standard where you please, but define it plainly; put no obstacles in our way; either afford us access to the ordinary means of medical education, or do not exact that we shall use your special methods; in either case subject us ultimately to exactly the ordinary examinations and tests, and, if we fail to acquit ourselves as well as your average students, reject us; if, on the contrary, in spite of all difficulties, we reach your standard, and fulfil all your requirements, the question of 'mental equality' is practically settled so far as it concerns our case; give us then the ordinary medical licence or diploma, and leave the question of our ultimate success or failure in practice to be decided by ourselves and the public.' This is our position, and I appeal, not to the chivalry, but to the justice, of the medical profession to show us that it is untenable, or else to concede it at once.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE."—*Lancet*, July 9, 1870.

NOTE D, p. 45.

The statement in the text was made the subject of a newspaper controversy; and I append the following very valuable evidence which was thus elicited in support of my assertion :—

"SIR,—Permit me to bear my testimony to the state of the facts on this question as far as English convents are concerned. I was for some years medical attendant to a Franciscan convent, and was frequently consulted by the nuns. They were examined and treated like other patients, except where certain maladies were concerned, and then they suffered in silence, or with such relief as could be given by medicines, after a diagnosis founded on questions and general symptoms only. I especially remember two cases. . . . In neither of these any examination was permitted, or any surgical treatment regarded as a possibility, in spite of all the representations I could make, and although, I believe, I possessed the full confidence of the patients and of the Superior. Whether a female surgeon would have been allowed to examine and operate I cannot say.—I am, Sir, yours, etc., F.R.C.S."—*Lancet*, May 18, 1872.

"SIR,—Kindly permit me to say a few words with regard to Miss Jex-Blake's statement, that very many women, and in particular, nuns, would certainly show a preference for the medical and surgical aid of one of their own sex, were any choice possible to them. As being myself a Catholic, and having many near relatives nuns, I can most confidently confirm this assertion.

"I have known, for many years, and in the closest intimacy, ladies, members of various religious orders, in this country and in France, and I am quite aware that recourse to male medical advice, in peculiar cases, is looked upon in religious houses as something much more painful than any physical suffering, or even death.

"My father was medical attendant to a convent of English nuns, and I think I may safely say that any advice given to nuns in such cases was entirely at second hand, the doctor's wife being the favourite resource in these emergencies. . . .

"Then, again, how can any man, medical or not, know what agonies of shame and outraged modesty women can and do undergo, when submitting to male medical and surgical treatment? How many women cannot overcome their repugnance, and die with their special ailments unsuspected, or discovered too late? On the other hand, how many women are at great pains to *conceal* the shrinking which they feel when exposing their peculiar ailments to even a long-known and valued medical man? Why should we have these added to our other unavoidable sufferings? The reality of these feelings is, I am certain, within the personal knowledge of every one of your female readers. No one wishes to deny modesty to the stronger sex; but let us suppose them *compelled* to reveal all their physical ills to *women*—how would they feel?—I am, etc., A CATHOLIC WIFE AND MOTHER."—*Scotsman*, May 27, 1872.

NOTE E, p. 49.

While revising the above for the press (May 1872), the following lines came under my notice, and I think them the more suitable to quote as they are from the pen of a woman who has never herself shown the least inclination for the study of medicine, and who, therefore, speaks entirely from the abstract point of view:—

"Nothing will ever make me believe that God meant men to be the ordinary physicians of women and babies. A few masculine experts might be tolerated in special institutions, so that cases of peculiar danger and difficulty might not be left, as they are now, to the necessarily one-sided treatment of a single sex; but, in general, if ever a created being was conspicuously and intolerably out of his natural sphere, it is, in my opinion, the male doctor in the apartment of the lying-in woman; and I think our sex is really guilty, in the first place, that it ever allowed man to appear there; and, in the second, that it does not insist upon educating women of character and intelligence and social position for that post.

"Indeed, common delicacy would seem to demand that all the special diseases of women should be treated principally by women; but this aside, and speaking from commonsense only, men may be as scientific as they please,—it is plain that thoroughly to know the woman's organism, what is good for it and what evil, and how it can best be cured when it is disordered, one must be one's self a woman. It only proves how much unworthy passion and prejudice the great doctors allow to intrude into their adoration of 'pure science' and boasted love of humanity, that, instead of being eager to enlist the feminine intuitions and investigations in this great cause, as their best chance of arriving at truth, they are actually enacting the ignoble part of churls and misers, if not of quacks. For are they not well enough aware that often their women patients are so utterly beyond them that they do not know what to do with them? The diseases of the age are nervous diseases, and women are growing more nervously high-strung and uncontrollable every day, yet the doctors stand helplessly by and cannot stop it. When, however, there shall be a school of doctresses of high culture and thorough medical education going in and out among the sex with the proper medical authority, they will see, and will be able to prevent, much of the moral and physical neglect and imprudence which, now unchecked in school and home, make such havoc of the vital forces of the present generation."—"*Co-operative Housekeeping*," by Mrs. C. F. Pierce.

NOTE F, p. 54.

"Now at last the vexed question of mixed classes will be solved, and there can be no doubt in the minds of those who have ever been engaged in scientific study of the favourable result to be expected. It is curious to note in the history of the present movement how, one after another, old objections have vanished, and old arguments have become no longer available. It is pretty certain that this last, and perhaps greatest stumbling-block to the minds of many will also disappear when it is seen with what beneficial results the system of mixed education is attended. And one great advantage to be expected is the benefit that will accrue from the higher reverence for science that must necessarily result from such a system. Once admit the impropriety of teaching men and women together, and you tax science with

impurity; and while such a feeling is entertained (and it surely must be lurking in the minds of those who oppose mixed classes), the study of science, if not absolutely injurious, must be robbed of great part of its power to elevate the mind and heart. . . . Science has had to fight many a hard battle. For a long time it was asserted that science and religion were antagonistic to each other, but a Faraday has shown us how the two may go hand in hand, each helping and supporting the other. Last April we were told that the study of science was linked with impurity of thought, and we look upon the present action of the Lecturers of Surgeons' Hall as a result of the indignant protest which every pure-minded man of science must have longed to utter against such a wholly false and calumnious statement. It is as the champions of science rather than of medical women that these gentlemen must be regarded. In any case science would have passed through this last attack, as she has ever done through all similar attacks, victorious and unscathed and unrestrained in her power to bless and help mankind; but the lecturers of our city have the no small honour of having publicly testified their unqualified conviction of the entire purity of all scientific knowledge and research. . . . Now that the Lecturers of Surgeons' Hall have come forward as a body to affirm the same principle, we may indeed hail the beginning of the end, and may trust soon to see the day when the man who condemns the teaching of science to classes of both men and women will simply stand self-convicted as wanting alike in true scientific spirit and in genuine purity of mind."

Daily Review, July 11, 1870.

"It seems that two ladies have this week applied for admission as students to St. Thomas's Hospital in London, and a medical contemporary makes this fact the excuse for a fresh onslaught on all women who may, for the sake of a thorough medical education, wish to enter the existing schools which at present possess a legal monopoly of that education. The editorial delicacy declares—'that any women should be found who desire such fellowship in study is to us inexplicable.' This ill-bred sneer directed against ladies as medical students is peculiarly ill-timed at a moment when the medical profession are loudly calling on women to come to their aid in the military hospitals of the Continent, teeming, as we know them to be, with horrors which certainly far surpass any that ladies are likely to encounter in their ordinary course of study, and which must inevitably be witnessed in company 'with persons of the opposite sex.' Certainly no reasons of delicacy at least can justify women's co-operation in the one case, and yet demand their exclusion in the other.

"The truth is, that of course a certain conventional standard of propriety exists, which it is well and desirable to maintain under ordinary circumstances, as between persons of opposite sexes; and this rule forbids the casual discussion of most medical and some scientific subjects in chance audiences composed of ladies and gentlemen. But a higher law remains behind—*Salus populi suprema Lex.* If perishing humanity cries aloud for help, as during the present fearful struggle, we should think little of the pretended delicacy which could hinder either men or women from flocking to the rescue, or bid them pause, 'in the name of modesty,' to consider whether, under these circumstances, drawing-room proprieties would always be observed. So, too, when the question really at stake is whether all women are to be deprived of the medical services of their own sex, for fear some men's 'delicacy' should be shocked by the idea of their studying in the ordinary class-rooms, it is time to protest that, true science being of necessity impersonal, is absolutely pure. We remember that, when an attack was made on Dr. Alleyne Nicholson, a month or two ago, for admitting women to his classes, he replied in a letter to one of the medical papers, that he laid 'small stress on the purity or modesty of those who find themselves able to extract food for improper feelings from a purely scientific subject,' and we confess that we are inclined to share his opinion, which we suspect will be that of all the noblest and most enlightened men of science.

"A great deal of nonsense has been talked with reference to 'mixed classes,' and as it is probable that the subject may come up again in a practical shape before long, it is as well to say a few plain words about the question at issue. First of all, let it be clearly established that medicine cannot be taught advantageously, nor indeed legally, in holes and corners to half-a-dozen or even a dozen students. In the very paper in which appeared the offensive paragraph to which we have alluded, we find a plea for the consolidation of the London Medical Schools into a smaller number, because 'there are not students enough' to support them all in perfection, and because two or three well-paid lecturers, with abundant apparatus, could teach to far greater advantage than twice or thrice that number under present circumstances. If this is true where there are at least several hundred students to be divided among the eleven existing schools, how palpably absurd is it to recommend our countrywomen to 'have separate places of medical education and examination,' when the whole number of ladies desiring to study medicine in England may perhaps number a score! Our own University professors tell us plainly that separate classes for half-a-dozen ladies are an impossibility, and the practical experience of Surgeons' Hall, pointing in the same direction, evidently guided its lecturers in their recent vote. The broad fact, therefore, must be accepted, that either the door must be shut in the face of all women, and that at a moment when some of them are proving to a demonstration their remarkable fitness to enter it, or they

must be allowed, as they long ago requested, to enter quietly and without remark, and take their places with other students, to learn the common lessons equally necessary for all.

"And after all, what are the arguments on the other side? We are told oracularly that what is proposed is *contra bonos mores*, and are warned with equal solemnity of the imminent downfall of any school that dares to break loose from the bondage of Medical Trades-Unionism and afford to women exactly the same advantages as to other students. We do not wish to speak solely, or even chiefly, in the interests of women; we wish to look at the question broadly and with a view to the possible moral results to the public at large; and from this point of view we cannot but feel that the more general association of the sexes in earnest labour, and especially in scientific and medical study, may be of the greatest importance to the community. Though the traditions of the Bob Sawyer period are happily passing away, there yet seems to linger an idea that medical students as a rule adopt a lower moral standard and are of a more generally reckless character than those studying for other professions. If this is so, may not the explanation be found in the sort of half-expressed idea that seems prevalent in so many people's minds, that there is in medical study something which, if not actually improper and indelicate, certainly tends that way, and had better be ignored as much as possible—something, at least, which the average public would probably sum up as 'rather nasty.' We believe that it is on this popular idea—which every true physician would indignantly disclaim—that the opponents of women's education trade when they try to enlist public feeling against mixed classes. They talk in a vague and very offensive way about certain studies which form a necessary part of medical education, and not being themselves capable of seeing the true dignity and profound purity of all science, especially when pursued with the aim of succouring pain and combating disease, they manage too often to impress the general public with the idea that by sanctioning the joint study of medicine by men and women the said public would commit itself to some shocking impropriety, all the more awful for being quite indefinite—*omne ignotum pro magnifico*. It is probable that this sort of vague terror is, in fact, the best weapon yet forged against women students, but like many another terror, it is one that vanishes in the clear daylight. Let it once be broadly understood that science has no hidden horrors, that the study of God's works can never be otherwise than healthful and beautiful to every student who brings to their contemplation a clear eye and a clean hand, and this weapon of darkness will be shivered for ever. We believe, indeed, that nothing could be more desirable for the average young medical student than to find himself associated in daily study with women whom he cannot but respect; nothing more calculated to give him an earnest sense alike of the dignity and of the purity of his vocation than to labour in it side by side with ladies whose character and whose motives are to him a daily reminder that he and they alike are set apart both as the votaries of science and the ministers of suffering humanity."—*Daily Review*, October 11, 1870.

NOTE G, p. 56.

The testimony of Dr. Agnes M'Laren with reference to her studies in the Medical Faculty at Montpellier is worthy of record:—

"I am glad of an opportunity to acknowledge my strong sense of the kindness and courtesy with which I was treated by all the professors and students at Montpellier, and I think my reception was the more remarkable because French women as a rule have so little liberty, the unmarried women never going out alone even in the morning. I know as a fact that many of the professors did not in the first instance like the admission of women. The Dean informed me on my first arrival that he could not inscribe me as a student until he received official authority to do so from the Minister of Public Instruction, but that for the intervening month or two I might request permission to attend the Professor's classes informally. This permission was at once given by the Professors of Anatomy and Physiology (MM. Benoit and Rouget); but Mons. Boyer, Professor of Surgery, told me that he thought my presence would embarrass both him and myself. When, however, the official authorization arrived, nothing could exceed the loyalty and kindness with which all the professors carried the decision into effect. Professor Boyer did not wait for me to call on him, but called on me personally to assure me that as I was now *entitled* to be one of his students, no effort of his should be wanting to give me every advantage, and most honourably he kept his word. So also it was in the hospital, where, by the by, it was a real innovation for a woman to enter the male wards, for in France male nurses attend on male patients, which is rarely, if ever, the case in England. I was very much struck with what occurred on the morning of my first hospital visit. After going round the female wards, the house surgeon turned round to ask if I wished to go on with the other students into the male wards. Before, however, I could reply, the chief physician, Professor Combal, said promptly: 'Mais c'est le *devoir* de Mademoiselle de me suivre partout pendant la visite,—je suis bien sûr que Mademoiselle

fera son devoir.' It is difficult to exaggerate the delicacy and courtesy which saved me all embarrassment at a critical moment, and struck the right key-note once for all. With such teachers to set the example, it is not wonderful that the students treated me invariably with the utmost courtesy and kindness, nor is it surprising that I should be convinced that there is no real difficulty about mixed classes, for I should be sorry to believe that Englishmen and Scotchmen are so inferior to their French neighbours that what is easily practicable in France is not possible at home."

NOTE H, p. 67.

The following extracts will show the position and opportunities of study enjoyed by lady probationers and nurses at London hospitals. The first is taken from a letter written by a lady who was herself trained as a surgical nurse in a hospital. She writes :—

"In the ordinary course of the day's work, I went round the wards with the visiting surgeons, and at the same time as the students, and, in fact, I should think, enjoyed exactly the same opportunities that people profess to be so much shocked at your desiring to obtain in Edinburgh. Part of my time was spent in study in the female and part in the male wards; and I never found either students or patients see anything at all exceptional in my presence in the latter, though I often had to perform services for the male patients which would never be expected of you as students. When any patients from my wards went into the theatre for operation, I, as a matter of course, accompanied them, and was present during the operation, standing often quite near the surgeon, however many students might be there at the time. I was, therefore, constantly associated with the students in the hospital work, as were all the other ladies studying in the same capacity, and I never saw any difficulty in this arrangement, nor had any reason to suppose that the students did."

Thinking that a lady's evidence might be challenged on this matter, I wrote to one of the principal surgeons of the Middlesex Hospital for confirmation of her statement, and received the following reply :—

"Nurses and lady probationers are present in the wards, and attend the surgeons in their visits, and are present at operations. The students never, so far as I observed, took any notice of the question as to whether the female attendants in the wards were ladies or ordinary nurses—never, in short, troubled themselves about them."

While on the subject, I will quote an extract from a letter received from Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, the first Englishwoman who ever received a medical degree. She says :—

"I walked St. Bartholomew's Hospital in the years 1850-51. I received permission to do so from the Governors, and was received by the medical faculty with a friendly courtesy for which I shall always be grateful. I always went round with the class of students during the physician's visits. The medical class numbered about thirty students. I spent between five and six hours daily in recording and studying cases. During the visits, I never received anything but courtesy from the students. When studying in the wards, I received much kind assistance from the clinical clerks and dressers. While leaving the hospital the treasurer said to me—'When we gave you permission to enter, we thought we were doing something so unusual that we were rather anxious about the result, but, really, everything has gone on so quietly, so exactly as usual, that we had almost forgotten you were here.' . . . My observation of mixed study is, that a small select number of women may join an ordinary school with little difficulty, and that there is even less trouble in arranging hospital visiting than class-room instruction."

The last case that I will cite with reference to hospital instruction is that of Mrs. Leggett, who in 1872 attended as a regular student in Stevens' Hospital, Dublin, and who writes :—

"I had the unanimous consent of the Board to pursue my medical studies in Stevens' Hospital. As to the medical students, they are always civil. Dr. Macnamara, President of the College of Physicians of Ireland, said it was his opinion that the presence of ladies would refine the classes."

With reference to the attendance of this lady, Dr. Hamilton, Medical Secretary of Stevens' Hospital, writes :—

"So far as we have gone, we find the education of mixed classes in one hospital to work very well."

NOTE I, p. 68.

For the edification of the next generation, to whom all this bigotry will probably appear almost incredible, I subjoin the passage alluded to in the text. I am sorry to say it is by no means the worst I might have quoted from the same paper :—

"For ourselves, we hold that the admission of women into the ranks of medicine is an egregious blunder, derogatory to the status and character of the female sex, and likely to be injurious, in the highest degree, to the interests and public estimation of the profession which they seek to invade.

"By insisting on the attendance of all students at the public-class delivery of anatomical lectures, and in the public-class dissecting-room, the only possible guarantee of uniformity of teaching will be obtained, and, at the same time, a difficulty will be placed in the way of female intrusion which it will not be easy for women of character, and clearly none else are eligible, to surmount. We hope, however, that the Court of Examiners will not stop with the erection of the barrier we suggest, but that they will distinctly refuse to admit any female candidate to examination unless compelled by a legal decision from the bench ; and we also hope that they will be supported in such refusal by the Master and Wardens of the Society, as well as by the profession out-of-doors."—*Medical Times and Gazette*, Feb. 27, 1867.

NOTE J, p. 78.

At the meeting of the University General Council immediately afterwards, Professor Masson gave the results of this examination, which may be of some interest as it was the first examination in a British university to which women were formally admitted. There were 147 men examined, and 5 women,—not of course all of them in every subject. In *English* one man and two women appeared in the highest grade "excellently well ;" in *Latin* seven men passed in the first grade, and one woman ; in *Arithmetic* two men and one woman were "*optimi ;*" in *Mathematics* ten men passed in the first grade, and three women ; in *Mechanics* thirteen men passed, and one woman ; in *French* there were only two "*optimi,*" both women ; in *Higher Mathematics* six men passed, and one woman ; in *German* one man passed, and one woman ; in *Logic* a woman took the fifth place ; and in *Moral Philosophy* the third.

"The results in general," said Professor Masson, "are that not one of the five women has been plucked, while four of them are decidedly among the very first in all or most of the subjects they went in for ; indeed in some subjects, or by the combined strength of various subjects, these four women rank with three or four men (if with so many) as *facile principes* of the whole examination. Here, at all events, is another argument. The Medical Council have decided what intellectual qualifications are desirable or necessary before there can be admission to the study of medicine. Here, out of a crowd of 152 candidates who have marched in procession up to this wicket, when you examine you find that among the seven foremost are four women."—*Daily Review*, October 30, 1869.

NOTE K, p. 82.

The following are a few only out of very many expressions of public indignation at this episode :—

"One of the most singular of University 'scandals' comes to us from decorous Edinburgh. True, it is the very antithesis of cases—such as are only too familiar on this side the Border

—of debauchery at night, and a scene in court next morning, but it is not a whit the less discreditable. The transgressor, however, is not a college student, but a college professor. The case admits of, we might say demands, historic treatment. Some years ago, Dr. Hope, then Professor of Chemistry in the University, gave a course of lectures to ladies—at that time quite an experiment—and was so much gratified, we are told, at their popularity, that he devoted the proceeds, amounting to about a thousand pounds, to found what have since been termed Hope Scholarships. We now get to a very modern period indeed. The Chemistry class during last winter numbered no less than 232 students, of whom six were ladies, who had been admitted to study in the medical classes, 'in accordance with the decision of the University authorities at the beginning of the session.' A few days ago the results of the examination were made known, when it appeared that one lady, Miss Mary Edith Pechey, was in the proud position of third in the list of honours, and another lady, Miss Sophia Jex-Blake, tenth. Miss Pechey's success is the more gratifying, inasmuch as she is a fresh student, while the two gentlemen who stood above her on the list have attended a previous course of lectures. Dr. Crum Brown, the Professor of Chemistry, in announcing the results, took upon himself to say that he should pass over Miss Pechey and award one of the Hope Scholarships to the next male on the list. This is directly in the teeth of the regulations made and provided for his guidance; according to which these scholarships are to be awarded to 'the four students whose names stand highest in the Chemistry class for the session.' We understand that Professor Crum Brown justifies his action on the ignoble plea 'that the women now studying in the University class do not form part of the University class, on account of their meeting at a different hour.' Great indignation has very naturally been excited in Edinburgh by this incident, and the question has been referred to the Senate of the University, who, though a corporate body, will, we hope, act as honourable men."—*Manchester Examiner and Times*, April 6, 1870.

"The inferior sex has always been a nuisance and a bore. A wise old Sultan of Turkey used to ask, whenever anything went wrong, 'Who was she?' One day while the Sultan was making an addition to his palace (as is the habit of Sultans), a labourer fell from the scaffold and was killed. 'Who was she?' said the Sultan at once. The inferior sex is always plaguing the superior sex in one way or another, and now it seems that the inferior sex are winning *our* scholarships over our most sacred heads. This is a matter which must be looked to. We will stand a great deal, but this is going a little too far; we must agitate; members must pledge themselves on the hustings to a bill providing that any one of the inferior sex who gains a scholarship must not have it at any price whatever, or we shall all be undone. We must have an Act for the repression of women; we are very sorry to say such terrible words, but the thing must be done; it had better be done at once while the nation is in a mood for repression. Particular cases thrust themselves prominently on the national mind, and cause legislation: the Coercion Bill for Ireland was thrust on to an unwilling Government by a very few of the later agrarian outrages: the last ounce breaks the camel's back. If Miss Edith Pechey chooses to come in *facile princeps* at the head of the Chemistry Class of her year, we of the superior sex must really look to ourselves. We have the power of legislation still left in our hands, and we warn such ladies as Miss Edith Pechey and Miss Jex-Blake that we shall use it. We must have a bill for the protection of the superior sex.

"We feel sure that the ladies will forgive joking about a very absurd matter. Ladies should surely understand the power of ridicule. We think that the '*reductio ad absurdum*' in this matter is the proper line of argument. The facts of the case seem to be simply these:—After protracted delays and much discussion, the University authorities last autumn vouchsafed to ladies the permission to enter the College as matriculated medical students, with the single restriction that their instruction should be conducted in separate classes. On referring to the minutes of the University Court, we find the following definition of the position to be taken by the new students:—'All women attending such classes shall be subject to all the regulations now, or at any future time, in force in the University as to the matriculation of students, their attendance on classes, examination, or otherwise.' We turn to the Calendar to see what are the 'regulations in force in the University' as to examination in chemistry, and we find at page 84 the following:—'The class honours are determined by means of written examinations held during the sesson. The four students who have received the highest marks *are entitled to have the Hope Scholarships* to the laboratory of the University.' The ladies accepted in good faith the regulations of the University, and, fired by a laudable ambition to prove themselves worthy of the privileges now accorded for the first time to women, worked with an assiduity that may be guessed when it is found that one of them, Miss Pechey, actually gained the highest number of marks awarded during the session to any student attending chemistry for the first time, though she was excelled (by one and two marks respectively) by two gentlemen who had gone through a previous course of lectures. But when the day arrived which was to reward all this work, the Professor announced, without, as it seemed to us, a shadow of justification, that the four scholarships would be given, *not* according to the University regulations to the four students '*entitled to them*,' but to the three

gentlemen who had won the first, second, and fourth places, and to the one who stood fifth on the list, this last having earned a most honourable place by his talents and industry, but *not* the Hope Scholarship, though now he has, of course, the right to claim free admission to the laboratory as it has been promised to him. This, then, is a University episode. Six students are admitted on the distinct understanding that, with one exception (dictated, as we think, by a whimsical propriety), they are to be 'subject to the regulations of the University;' no hint is given to them that this statement is analogous to the one which pithily describes women's political condition in England—'*He* means *she* when it's a question of hanging; *he* doesn't mean *she* when it's a question of voting.' The ladies are encouraged to exert their utmost power for work; when the rewards are to come, and it is found that one of them has earned one of the highest honours attainable by the class, she is calmly informed that that honour has been given to somebody else! A neater instance of generosity with other people's property it has never been our lot to witness, and we don't care how long it is before we repeat the experience.

"The only excuse that we can with the utmost stretch of charity imagine in this case would be that Dr. Crum Brown thought some difficulty might arise respecting Miss Pechey's use of the scholarship (which gives free admittance to the laboratory), under the restrictions now imposed on women by the University Court—for we will not suppose for a moment that the Professor could himself wish to impede the further progress of a student of such merit. But if such difficulty occurred it might be an excellent reason for relaxing those restrictions, when they are seen to deprive a student of the full reward of her past work, and at the same time to prevent her prosecuting further the study in which she has so distinguished herself; but we are quite at a loss to see how any legitimate argument can be drawn thence to justify Dr. Brown in laying violent hands on a scholarship which has been fairly earned by one person for the purpose of presenting it to another. It is possible that A's circumstances may prevent his deriving full benefit from some of his possessions, but the law would hardly consider this fact a valid reason for B's 'annexing' the said possession for the benefit of C. If Dr. Brown chooses to admit a fifth student to the laboratory he can of course do so, but unless we are greatly mistaken he will propably be informed by the Law Faculty (whom he might previously have consulted with advantage) that neither he nor any other person can alter the fact that Miss Pechey and no one else *is* third Hope Scholar."

—*Daily Review*, April 1, 1870.

"A very odd and very gross injustice appears to have been attempted in the University of Edinburgh. In that University the lady medicals are taught in a separate class—not from any wish of their own, but through the delicacy of the professors. In the chemical class, Miss Edith Pechey gained the third place, and was first of the first year's students, the two men who surpassed her having attended the class before. The four students who get the highest marks receive four Hope Scholarships—scholarships founded by Dr. Hope some years ago out of the proceeds of a very popular *ladies' class* of chemistry, with the success of which he had been much gratified. Yet Miss Edith Pechey was held by the professor not to be entitled to the third scholarship, and omitting her name, he included two men whom she had beaten, and who stood fourth and fifth in the examination, his excuse being that women are not part of the University class, because they are separately taught. Yet Dr. Crum Brown awards Miss Pechey a bronze medal, to which only members of the University class are said to be entitled! It is quite clear that such a decision cannot stand. To make women attend a separate class, for which they have to pay, we believe, much higher fees than usual, and then argue that they are out of the pale of competition because they do so, is, indeed, too like the captious schoolmaster who first sent a boy into the corner and then whipped him for not being in his seat."—*Spectator*, April 9, 1870.

"The letter Miss Pechey addressed to us the other day was written in an admirable spirit, and must insure her the hearty sympathy of all, whatever their opinions upon the points in question. She has done her sex a service, not only by vindicating their intellectual ability in an open competition with men, but still more by the temper and courtesy with which she meets her disappointments. Under any view of the main question, her case is a hard one, for it is clear both she and the other lady students were led to attend the classes under the misapprehension of the privileges to which they were admissible. If the University intended to exclude ladies from the pecuniary advantages usually attached to successful study, the intention should have been clearly announced. Miss Pechey, in the spirit of a true student, says she is abundantly repaid for her exertions by the knowledge she has acquired; but it is none the less hard that, having been encouraged to labour for a coveted reward, and having fairly won it, she should be disqualified by a restriction of which no warning had been given her."—*Times*, April 25, 1870.

"There are probably few persons who did not learn with regret the decision of the Edinburgh Senatus in respect of the Hope Scholarships. It is not pleasant that such a story of, at least, seeming injustice should circulate through foreign universities, to the discredit of

our own, for there cannot be much doubt as to the view that will be taken of the case by those nations—now forming the majority in Europe—who have admitted women to their medical colleges on terms of exact fairness and equality with their other students. . . . A medical contemporary argues that this affair proves how unwise it was to admit women to the University of Edinburgh—such admission being, as is asserted, the natural source of 'constant squabbles.' But most unprejudiced people, judging the case at first sight, would surely rather see here the evil of a partial, restricted, and permissive legislation. If women have a claim to medical education at all, they have exactly the same claim as men; if they are to be received as students at all, they must certainly be treated with even-handed justice, and not as social or rather academical *pariahs*, to whom the bare crumbs of instruction are vouchsafed as a grace and bounty; while all the honours and rewards are to be reserved to their male competitors. Looking at the thing for a moment, merely in the interests of the young men, and as a question of expediency, we cannot imagine anything much worse for their moral guidance than to find that women are indeed to compete with them, but so shackled that they can never win; or rather that, if they do win, the prizes will be snatched from their grasp and given to men whom they have beaten. We have heard that, in both classes where the ladies have this year studied, a very unusual access of zeal and energy has been noticed among the gentlemen in the other section of the class—a happy effect of such competition, which has often been observed in the mixed colleges of America, and which surely need not be neutralized here by the providence of the Senatus."—*Scotsman*, April 15, 1870.

"The Senatus has, by a small majority, confirmed Professor Crum Brown's decision with regard to Miss Pechey and the Hope Scholarship, on the grounds previously presumed by us. But these grounds, if so they may be called, are in our opinion insufficient to deprive Miss Pechey of the Scholarship. Whatever may be our views regarding the advisability of ladies studying medicine, the University of Edinburgh professed to open its gates to them on equal terms with the other students; and unless some better excuse be forthcoming in explanation of the decision of the Senatus, we cannot help thinking that the University has done no less an injustice to itself than to one of its most distinguished students."

—*British Medical Journal*, April 16, 1870.

NOTE L, p. 83.

"Shame upon thee, great Edina! Shame upon thee, thou hast done
Deed unjust, that makes our blushes flame as flames the setting sun.
You have wronged an earnest maiden, though you gave her honour's crown;
And eternal shame must linger round thy name, Professor Brown.

"Are you thus avenging Flodden? all that Randolph Murray told
Of those fatal hours of slaughter in the gallant days of old?
Does it rise before you, vowing that the English girl may win
Honour's guerdon, while you canny Scotchmen keep her well-earned 'tin'?

"Where erst Lyon Playfair lectured, there Miss Pechey won her prize,
Gain'd by brainwork true and steady, not by glance of brightest eyes;
There Crum Brown declared her worthy; but the scholarship, the meed
Of her efforts, he denied her, and the Senate praised the deed!

"Ah! fair lady, how remembrance brings 'Auld Reekie' back once more,
All the student life and frolic in the merry days of yore;
How we slanged the grave professors, how we spree'd about the town,
How, ye gods! as at Reid concerts, we'd have warm'd Professor Brown.

"Did you ever go, I wonder,—where in those old days we went,—
To the 'Little Pump,' unheeding how the idle hours were spent?
With the Rutherfordian tipple many goblets would we fill;
And when Forbes Mackenzie beckon'd, bid a fair goodnight to Hill.

"Did you go to Demonstrations?—Turner gave them in my day.
Did you hear old 'Woody Fibre' lecture in peculiar way?
Did you ever shirk your Lectures? Did you, like the present bard,
Get certificates *en règle*, though the porter left your card?

"Well I know the great quadrangle, well I love the dear old place,
Though my 'pals' have all departed, every old familiar face.
In those halls I once dissected. Heavens! how muscles used to vex us,
And I cursed *transversalis* and (in Nerves) the Lumbar plexus.

"And I blush to-day on hearing how they've treated you, Miss P.,
How that wretched old Senatus has back'd up Professor B.
Ah! the 'Modern Athens' surely must have grown a scurvy place,
And the 'Varsity degraded to incur such dire disgrace."

—*The Period*, May 14, 1870.

NOTE M, p. 85.

For the credit of the profession, I append also the following indignant protest from the chief medical paper:—

"There are very varying opinions abroad in the medical profession and among the public, as to the advisability of allowing women to practise medicine. There are still more serious and widely-spread doubts as to the possibility of educating ladies in the same lecture-rooms and dissecting-rooms with male students. But, until last week, we were not aware that any one in the profession, or out of it, held that the mere fact of ladies wishing to be educated in common with men, in order that they might make sure of receiving the highest and most thorough scientific training, justified those who held contrary opinions in loading them with abuse and vulgar insult. It has been reserved for Dr. Laycock, professor in the famous University of Edinburgh, to set an example which, we trust, even the least courteous and gentlemanly of first-year's students will hesitate to follow. . . . We shall only remark that if the coarsest of those few students who still keep alive the bad traditions of the Bob Sawyer period had given utterance to the insinuations which were used by this distinguished professor, we should simply have shrugged our shoulders, and concluded that the delinquent would be at once expelled with ignominy from his school. Unfortunately there are no such punishments for highly-placed men like Dr. Laycock, but at the least we can express the deep indignation and disgust which we are certain every gentleman in the profession must feel at the outrage of which he has been guilty."—*Lancet*, April 30, 1870.

NOTE N, p. 89.

"The personal and private opinions of Her Majesty on any subject whatever will always command the respectful attention of the country; and they have, indeed, when she has chosen to express them, been uniformly found on the side of that which was intelligent, humane, and honourable. We very much doubt, however, the wisdom of drawing Her Majesty into the discussion of such a matter as that which came before the University of Edinburgh the other day. The question whether women—who are by nature nurses—should be provided with a scientific education which would enable them to perform the duties of a nurse in the most efficient manner, is to be decided as part of a much larger question, with reference to the policy or impolicy of limiting the freedom of human beings in the choice and pursuit of a career. On more restricted grounds it may be discussed by persons of large experience in hospitals, on the battlefields, and even in the chambers of patients. It is far too important a matter to be debated on the very pleasant and desirable relations which exist between ladies and gentlemen in a drawing-room. Humanity is subject to accidents, which compel us to forget those distinctions and delicacies of feeling which are very proper and grateful under ordinary circumstances; and, even on the plea of delicacy, it might be urged that feminine doctors would attend women who now shrink from the visit of a surgeon or a physician. But all these points—and also that of having separate classes for university female students, which seems to us desirable—are affected by a knowledge of what is necessary, not by what one might personally wish; and we very much regret that Dr. Christison should have thought fit to bring in the Queen's name into a discussion in which it may carry more weight than Her Majesty intended, or than it is entitled to. Women have a right to speak on the subject; but we naturally look for information to those women who have either distinguished themselves in literature and thought, or who have had practical knowledge of the terrible emergencies which dictate the abandonment of delicate personal scruples."

—*Daily News*, November 7, 1870.

"As the Council values the success of the 160 manly students who have protested against women, let it not ask them to compete with female cleverness; as it respects the gallantry of objecting professors, let it not force them to lecture to women; as it believes in the prerogative of Her Gracious Majesty to decide upon the destinies of her female subjects, let it hesitate to put into the hands of women a means of independent subsistence!"

—*Tyrone Constitution*, November 4, 1870.

NOTE O, p. 90

The following are the papers referred to in the text:—

(1.)—*Letter from the Lady Students.*

"My Lord and Gentlemen,—We, the undersigned registered students of medicine, beg to lay before you the following facts, and to request your kind attention to them:—

"On applying in the usual course for students' tickets of admission to attend the practice of the Royal Infirmary, we were informed by the clerk that the Managers were not prepared to issue tickets to *female* medical students. We earnestly request you to reconsider this decision on the following grounds:—

"1. That the authorities of the University of Edinburgh and of the School of the College of Physicians and Surgeons have admitted our right to study medicine with a view to graduation.

"2. That an important and indispensable part of medical education consists in attending the practice of a medical and surgical hospital, and that the regulations of the Licensing Boards require, as part of the curriculum of study, two years' attendance at a 'general hospital which accommodates not fewer than eighty patients, and possesses a distinct staff of physicians and surgeons.'

"3. That the only hospital in Edinburgh possessing the required qualifications is the Royal Infirmary, and that exclusion from that institution would therefore preclude the possibility of our continuing our course of medical study in this city.

"4. That, in the present state of divided opinion on the subject, it is possible that such a consummation may give satisfaction to some; but we cannot suppose that your honourable Board would wish to put yourselves in the attitude of rendering null and void the decisions of the authorities of the University of which we are matriculated students, and of the School of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, where we are now attending the classes of anatomy and surgery.

"5. That it has been the invariable custom of the Managers to grant tickets of admission to students of the University and of Surgeons' Hall, and that, as far as we are aware, no statute of the Infirmary limits such admission to students of one sex only.

"6. That the advertized terms on which the wards of the Infirmary are open to all registered and matriculated students were such as to leave no doubt on our minds that we should be admitted; if, therefore, our exclusion should be finally determined, we shall suffer great pecuniary loss and damage by this departure of the Managers from their advertized regulations.

"7. That if we are granted admission to the Infirmary by your honourable Board, there are physicians and surgeons on the hospital staff who will gladly afford us the necessary clinical instruction, and find no difficulty in doing so. In support of the above assertion, we beg to enclose the accompanying papers, marked A and B.

"8. That we are fellow-students of systematic and theoretical surgery with the rest of Dr. Watson's class in Surgeons' Hall, and are therefore unable to see what legitimate objection can be raised to our also attending with them his hospital visit.

"9. That a large proportion of the patients in the Infirmary being women, and women being present in all the wards as nurses, there can be nothing exceptional in our presence there as students.

"10. That in our opinion no objection can be raised to our attending clinical teaching, even in the male wards, which does not apply with at least equal force to the present instruction of male students in the female wards.

"11. That we are unable to believe it to be in consonance with the wishes of the majority of the subscribers and donors to the Infirmary (among whom are perhaps as many women as men) that its educational advantages should be restricted to students of one sex only, when students of the other sex also form part of the regular medical classes.

"We beg respectfully to submit the above considerations to the notice of your honourable Board, and trust that you will reconsider your recent decision, which threatens to do us so great an injury, and that you will issue directions that we, who are *bona fide* medical

students, registered in the Government Register by authority of the General Council of Medical Education and Registration of the United Kingdom, be henceforth admitted to your wards on the same terms as other students.—We are, my Lord and Gentlemen, yours obediently,

"Sophia Jex-Blake, Mary Edith Pechey, Isabel J. Thorne, Matilda C. Chaplin, Helen Evans, Mary A. Anderson, Emily Bovell."

"November 5, 1870, 15 Buccleuch Place."

"November 5, 1870.

"*Paper A.*—We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons of the Royal Infirmary, desire to signify our willingness to allow female students of medicine to attend the practice of our wards, and to express our opinion that such attendance would in no way interfere with the full discharge of our duties towards our patients and other students.—J. Hughes Bennett, George W. Balfour, Patrick Heron Watson."

In *paper B*, two other medical men expressed their readiness, if suitable arrangements could be made, to teach the female students in the wards separately.

(2.)—*Letter from Dr. Handyside and Dr. Watson.*

"November 5, 1870.

"My Lord and Gentlemen,—As lecturers in the Edinburgh Medical School we beg most respectfully to approach your honourable Board, on behalf of the eight female students of this school whom, we understand, you object to admit to the practice of the Royal Infirmary. On their behalf we beg to state :—

"1. That they are regularly registered students of medicine in this school.

"2. That they are at present attending, along with the other students, our courses of anatomy, practical anatomy, demonstrations of anatomy, and systematic surgery, in the school at Surgeons' Hall.

"3. That, as teachers of anatomy and surgery respectively, we find no difficulty in conducting our courses to such mixed classes composed of male and female students, 'sitting together on the same benches ; and that the presence of those eight female students has not led us to alter or modify our course of instruction in any way.

"4. That the presence of the female students, so far from diminishing the numbers entering our classes, we find both the attendance and the actual numbers already enrolled are larger than in previous sessions.

"5. That in our experience in these mixed classes the demeanour of the students is more orderly and quiet, and their application to study more diligent and earnest, than during former sessions when male students alone were present.

"6. That, in our opinion, if practical bedside instruction in the examination and treatment of cases is withheld from the female pupils by the refusal to them of access as medical students to the practice of the Infirmary, we must regard the value of any systematic surgical course thus rendered devoid of daily practical illustration, as infinitely less than the same course attended by male pupils, who have the additional advantage of the hospital instruction under the same teacher.

"7. That the surgical instruction, being deprived of its practical aspect by the exclusion of the female pupils from the Infirmary, and therefore from the wards of their systematic surgical teacher, the knowledge of these female students may very reasonably be expected to suffer, not only in class-room examinations, but in their capacity to practise their profession in after life.

"8. That our experience of mixed classes leads us to the conviction that the attendance of the female students at the ordinary hospital visit, along with the male students, cannot certainly be more objectionable to the male students and the male patients than the presence of the ward nurses, or to the female patients than the presence of the male students.

"9. That the class of society to which these eight female students belong, together with the reserve of manner, and the serious and reverent spirit in which they devote themselves to the study of medicine, make it impossible that any impropriety could arise out of their attendance upon the wards as regards either patients or male pupils.

"In conclusion, we trust that your honourable Board may see fit, on considering these statements, to resolve not to exclude these female students from the practice of, at all events, those physicians and surgeons who do not object to their presence at the ordinary visit along with the other students.

"Such an absolute exclusion of female pupils from the wards of the Royal Infirmary as such a decision of your honourable Board would determine, we could not but regard as an act of practical injustice to pupils who, having been admitted to the study of the medical profession, must have their further progress in their studies barred if hospital attendance is refused them.—We are, my Lord and Gentlemen, your obedient servants, P. D. Handyside, Patrick Heron Watson."

At a meeting of the lecturers of the Extra-mural School, held in Surgeons' Hall, on Wednesday, November 9, the following resolution was proposed and carried, a corresponding communication being laid before the Managers at their meeting on Saturday, November 12, 1870 :—

"That the extra-mural lecturers in the Edinburgh Medical School do respectfully approach the Managers of the Royal Infirmary, petitioning them not to offer any opposition to the admission of the female students of medicine to the practice of the institution."

The following letter was also submitted at the next meeting :—

"15 Buccleuch Place, Nov. 13, 1870.

"My Lord and Gentlemen,—To prevent any possible misconception, I beg leave, in the name of my fellow-students and myself, to state distinctly that, while urgently requesting your honourable Board to issue to us the ordinary students' tickets for the Infirmary (as they alone will 'qualify' for graduation), we have, in the event of their being granted, no intention whatever of attending in the wards of those physicians and surgeons who object to our presence there, both as a matter of courtesy, and because we shall be already provided with sufficient means of instruction in attending the wards of those gentlemen who have expressed their perfect willingness to receive us.—I beg, my Lord and Gentlemen, to subscribe myself your obedient servant, Sophia Jex-Blake.

"To the Honourable the Managers of the Royal Infirmary."

NOTE P, p. 91.

As ballads are said to be even more significant than laws of the popular feeling, I do not apologize for appending the following :—

THE CHARGE OF THE FIVE HUNDRED ;

A LAY OF MODERN ATHENS.

(*Suggested by a recent Students' Song, containing the following verse :—*

> "*The little band plied the battering ram,*
> *With General Blake at its head,*
> *When 'specials' rose five hundred strong,*
> *And raised the siege—they fled,*
> *Brave Boys!*")

Once more the trumpets sound to arms !
Once more ring forth war's wild alarms !
Once more be Scotia's host poured forth
To guard the bulwarks of the North—
The foe is o'er the Tweed !
Bring forth the banner Flodden saw,
Rear high the standard of the war !
Let every Gael in battle stand,
To drive the invader from the land—
Speed to the rescue, speed !

What mean the rushing footsteps fleet ?
What mean the squadrons in the street ?
"Five hundred specials" now appearing—
Five hundred voices hoarsely cheering,
Wild and disorderly !
Strange oaths pollute the evening air,
Foul jests the banners proudly bear ;
What mean these bands in fierce array ?
Champions of "delicacy" they,
And manly modesty.

Then marked the bard who stood afar
The gallant leaders of the war—
The plumèd crest of Andrew Wood,
Who for his sons in battle stood,
A Christison hard by!
A Turner, Laycock, Lister too,
All met for deeds of derring-do;
Gillespie, Douglas (Oh, that shame
Should fall on that time-honoured name!),
Dun-Edin's chivalry.

To arms! to arms! the foe is nigh,
"Five hundred specials" do or die!
Admiring Europe's eyes are cast
On Scotia's greatest fight, and last,
O'er her Infirmary!
Press on! press on! immortal gods!
What matter if o'erwhelming odds
Make others blush,—*they* know no shame,
"Brave boys!" led on by chiefs of name
To glorious victory!

The foe at last! With modest mien
And gentle glance, at length are seen
The seven women, whom to crush
The noble hundreds onward rush,
Undaunted to the fray!
What if in idle tales of yore
The man to guard the woman swore!
Such trash is bygone!—*now* men stand
To guard their *craft* from female hand,
In nineteenth century!

"*Women* to claim *our* lordly state!"
Cries Reverend Phin in fierce debate.
"*Women* to strive *our* gains to share!"
Shrieks Andrew Wood in wild despair,
"While five fair sons have I!"
"That *English* girls should thus aspire!"
Quoth Christison in Scottish ire.
"Though their princess to Scotland come,
We'll drive these errant damsels home,
For hospitality!"

"Great is Diana!" loudly cry,
Be imprecations heard on high!
Be mud upgathered from the street,
And flung with ribald oaths, to gree
The dreadful enemy!
Seven women yield, they must confess
On t'other side is *major vis;*
Glorious Five Hundred, O rejoice!
Swell, each "brave boy" with tuneful voice,
Pæans of victory!

—*Scotsman*, Feb. 10, 1871.

NOTE Q, p. 94.

The following letter is an excellent illustration of the indignation felt by the more manly students at the events referred to:—

"EDINBURGH, November 19, 1870

"SIR,—As a certain class of medical students are doing their utmost to make the name of medical student synonymous with all that is cowardly and degrading, it is imperative upon all those who wish to be regarded as men, either individually or collectively, to come forward and express, in the strongest possible terms, their detestation of the proceedings which have characterized and dishonoured the opposition to ladies pursuing the study of medicine in Edinburgh. In the name, then, of all that is courteous and manly, I, as a student of medicine,

most indignantly protest against such scenes as were enacted at the College of Surgeons on the evenings of Thursday and Friday last, and indeed on several occasions during the week.

"I would it were possible to point out to public execration the movers and actors in such scenes; but it is difficult to decide where the responsibility begins.

"Are only the hot-headed youths to be blamed who hustle and hoot at ladies in the public streets, and by physical force close the College gates before them? Or are we to trace their outrageous conduct to the influence of the class-room, where their respected professor meanly takes advantage of his position as their teacher to elicit their mirth and applause, to arouse their jealousy and opposition, by directing unmanly inuendoes at the lady students? If such conduct be permissible on the part of the professors, alas for the school whose teachers have not even but one halfpennyworth of manliness to their intolerable deal of nastiness, or boasted philanthropy, as the case may be, and whose students crowd the academic precincts to hustle, hoot at, cover with mud, and even to strike at, ladies who have always shown themselves to be gentle and noble women.

"The current report is, that these disgraceful outrages were originally and principally carried out by students of the College of Surgeons. This is contrary to fact. Certainly the majority of them conducted themselves in a most contemptible manner, roused, not by a word or look from the ladies, but by the possibility of being outstripped by them in the race for honours; and therefore did they elect to end the rivalry by an appeal to brute force. The truth, however, is that the rioters were called together by a missive, circulated by the students in the *Chemistry Class of the University* on Friday morning, on the back of which was written, "To be opened by those who signed the petition to the managers against the admission of female students." This missive called upon the petitioners to assemble at the College of Surgeons before four o'clock, for the purposes which they so thoroughly carried out. The proceedings of Friday will therefore enable the public now to judge of the value which the majority of the managers of the Infirmary ought to have attached to the prayers of *such* petitioners. Moreover, the professor who is to receive the complimentary address which is being got up by the same memorialists for his exertions in their cause, must feel highly flattered by the implied association.

"What now is to be done with this vexed question of female education? Will it be settled by continuing those brutal exhibitions, or by asking the ladies to withdraw? Neither course is likely to prove successful. Another and a more honourable course has been suggested by some of the original memorialists, who—considering their honour dearer to them than their sympathies—declare that the blot can only be wiped away by their joining to aid the ladies who have been so thwarted and so abused in obtaining the object for which they have wrought so hard and endured so bravely.—I am, etc., VIR."—*Scotsman*, November 22, 1870.

NOTE R, p. 101.

The following is the petition referred to:—

"*To the Honourable the Managers of the Royal Infirmary.*

"MY LORD AND GENTLEMEN,—We, the undersigned students of medicine, moved solely by feelings of honour and justice, desire to approach your honourable Board on behalf of our female fellow-students, whom, we understand, you object to admit to the practice of the Infirmary, under any circumstances whatever.

"We do not pretend to offer any opinion on the question of mixed classes, or on the medical education of women; but we consider that, as the University of Edinburgh has admitted those ladies as students of medicine, and as they have now been engaged for some time in striving honourably and successfully to gain a knowledge of our profession, it is great injustice to attempt to bar their further progress by refusing them permission to attend the practice of the Infirmary.

"We also have certain pretensions to feelings of decency and morality, but we are not aware that the lady students have either attempted or succeeded in outraging them. On the contrary, our feelings have been outraged by the unthinking and misguided of those of our own class who oppose them; for their disgraceful actions we would seek to atone by asking your honourable Board to make some arrangement by which the ladies may be admitted to the practice of the wards.

"As a matter of compromise, we would respectfully request that the ladies be admitted to the wards of the three medical gentlemen who are willing to receive them. On our part we beg leave to express our perfect willingness to attend with them in considering the most serious and delicate cases in the wards.

"We feel proud to assert our ability to study those cases from scientific and philanthropic points of view, with those feelings of delicacy and kindness which ought to actuate every medical man who has female patients under his care."

NOTE S, p. 105.

"COMMITTEE FOR SECURING A COMPLETE MEDICAL EDUCATION TO WOMEN IN EDINBURGH.

"In view of the determined opposition from certain quarters which has met every effort made by ladies to obtain a medical education in Edinburgh, it was resolved, in January 1871, that a Committee should be formed, comprising all those who felt the injustice of the present arbitrary exclusion of women from the medical profession, and who desired to co-operate in the following objects:—(1.) To arrive at a thorough understanding of the real difficulties of the case, distinguishing clearly between those hindrances which are interposed by prejudice or self-interest, and the real obstacles (if any) which are inherent in the question. (2.) To secure the admission of women to Edinburgh University on the ordinary terms, though not necessarily in the same classes with men. (3.) To provide the means of qualifying Hospital instruction in Edinburgh for all ladies who are registered students of medicine.

"To these primary objects the circumstances of the case have subsequently led the Committee to add the following:—(4.) To make such temporary arrangements as may be required to provide the ladies with qualifying instruction, in accordance with the present incomplete regulations of the University, until such time as the authorities themselves may see fit to make complete and adequate arrangements. (5.) To co-operate, from time to time, with the lady students, whenever necessary, and especially to aid them in obtaining such legal assistance as may be required to ascertain and assert their rights as matriculated students of the University, and as registered students of medicine.

"Of this Committee the Lord Provost of Edinburgh consented to act as chairman; and the following constituted the original Executive Committee: The Right Hon. The Lord Provost; Dr. G. W. Balfour; Professor Bennett, M.D.; Dowager Countess of Buchan; Mrs. Hill Burton; Professor Calderwood; Treasurer Colston; Andrew Coventry, Esq.; James Cowan, Esq.; Mrs. Fleeming Jenkin; Mrs. Henry Kingsley; Professor Lorimer; Professor Masson; Miss Agnes M'Laren; David M'Laren, Esq.; Dr. Macnair; John Muir, Esq., D.C.L.; Mrs. Nichol; Dr. Niven; Alexander Nicholson, Esq.; Admiral Sir W. Ramsay, K.C.B.; Dr. Heron Watson; Miss Eliza Wigham. W. S. Reid, Esq., *Hon. Treasurer;* Miss L. Stevenson, *Hon. Sec.*"

The balance-sheet issued by the Executive Committee may be of interest. It will be seen that the £1067 subscribed for the costs in the "libel" case has not been included in this account; so that the total sum contributed was £3255.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS, from January 1871 to January 1879.

Receipts.				*Expenditure.*			
Received prior to July 1st 1873—				Printing, Stationery, etc., . .	£207	19	0
Subscriptions to General Fund,	£1318	10	0	Postage, ...	88	5	8
,, ,, Law Expenses,	5	0	0	Advertising, ...	51	1	4
Received from July 1st, 1873, to January 31st, 1874—				Expenses of separate Classes, 1871–72, 1872–73, 1873–74 (in addition to Students' Fees, amounting to £618, 9s.), . .	426	8	6
Subscriptions to General Fund,	122	11	0	Newspapers sent to Members of Committee, . . .	12	11	1
,, ,, Law Expenses,	612	11	0	250 Copies of "Medical Women" for distribution (1872), . .	31	5	0
,, ,, Future Medical School for Women, .	100	0	0	Hire of Committee Rooms, . .	6	4	0
Bank Interest, ...	38	13	5	Law Expenses—			
Received from January 31st, 1874, to January 27th, 1879—				University Lawsuit, £851 10 3			
Subscriptions to General Fund,	15	0	0	Opinions of Counsel, 181 13 9			
,, ,, Law Expenses,	15	5	6		1033	4	0
Bank Interest, ...	37	16	8	Expenses of Enquiries and Applications to Universities, etc., .	76	13	10
				Expenses of Petitions, . . .	15	8	9
				Assistant Secretary, . . .	9	8	3
				Sundry Petty Expenses, . .	1	16	8
				Paid to London School of Medicine for Women, . . .	100	0	0
				Grant to Edinburgh Dispensary for Women and Children, . .	50	0	0
					£2110	6	1
				On Deposit Receipt with Bank, .	155	1	6
	£2265	7	7		£2265	7	7

NOTE T, p. 106.

Perhaps the most remarkable petition sent up to Parliament in our favour was one signed by nearly 200 medical men, from whose names my space allows me to select only a handful, viz. :—

John Adams, F.R.C.S.; T. Clifford Allbutt, M.D.; Francis E. Anstie, M.D.; Archibald Billing, M.D.; Lionel Beale, M.D.; Robert Beveridge, M.D.; John Birkett, F.R.C.S.; W. H. Broadbent, M.D.: Charlton Bastian, M.D.; William B. Carpenter, M.D.; Thomas King Chambers, M.D.; Andrew Clark, M.D.; Sir James Coxe, M.D.; W. B. Cheadle, M.D.; Charles A. Cameron, M.D.; Campbell De Morgan, F.R.C.S.; J. E. Erichsen, F.R.C.S.; W. H. Flower, F.R.C.S.; Joseph Hooker, M.D., C.B., D.C.L.; Joseph B. Hardie, M.B.; Berkeley Hill, M.B.; George Harley, M.D.; N. Heckford, M.R.C.S.; F. Brodie Imlach, F.R.C.S.; J. Hughlings Jackson, M.D.; Thomas Keith, M.D.; Edwin Lankester, M.D.; Sir Ranald Martin, F.R.C.S.; Rawdon Macnamara, Pres. R.C.S.I.; J. G. M'Kendrick, M.D.; C. Murchison, M.D.; Robert M'Donnell, M.D.; J. R. Martin, *Inspect. Gen. Hosp.*; John Murray, M.D.; John Niven, M.D.; A. T. Norton, F.R.C.S.; T. W. Nunn, F.R.C.S.; J. Frank Payne, M.D.; J. Russell Reynolds, M.D.; Andrea Rabagliati, M.B.; E. H. Sieveking, M.D.; W. Tyler Smith, M.D.; F. W. Salzmann, M.R.C.S.; J. A. Sidey, M.D.; Sir Henry Thompson, F.R.C.S.; T. Hawkes Tanner, M.D.; G. Thin, M.D.; Forbes Winslow, M.D.; Alexander Wood, M.D.

NOTE U, p. 108.

What I said was, I believe, correctly reported in the *Scotsman* as follows :—

"I want to point out that it was certain of these same men, who had (so to speak) pledged themselves from the first to defeat our hopes of education, and render all our efforts abortive —who, sitting in their places on the Infirmary Board, took advantage of the almost irresponsible power with which they were temporarily invested to thwart and nullify our efforts. I believe that a majority of the managers desired to act justly in this matter; but the presence of those bitter partisans, and the overwhelming influence of every kind brought to bear by them, prevailed to carry the day—to refuse us not only admission on the ordinary terms, but also to refuse us every opportunity which could answer our purpose. I know of the noble protests made against this injury by some of the most respected and most learned members of the Board, but all their efforts were in vain, because strings were pulled and weapons brought into play of which they either did not know or could not expose the character. Till then, during a period of five weeks, the conduct of the students with whom we had been associated in Surgeons' Hall, in the most trying of all our studies, that of Practical Anatomy, had been quiet, respectful, and in every way inoffensive. They had evidently accepted our presence there in earnest silent work, as a matter of course, and Dr. Handyside, in answer to a question of mine after the speeches made at the meeting of the General Council, assured me that in the course of some twenty sessions, he had never had a month of such quiet, earnest work as since we entered his rooms. But at a certain meeting of the managers, when our memorial was presented, a majority of those present were. I understand, in favour of immediately admitting us to the Infirmary. The minority alleged want of due notice to the question, and succeeded in obtaining an adjournment. What means were used in the interim I cannot say, or what influence was brought to bear; but I do know that from that day the conduct of the students was utterly changed, that those who had hitherto been quiet and courteous became impertinent and offensive; and at last came the day of that disgraceful riot, when the college gates were shut in our faces and our little band bespattered with mud from head to foot —(shame). It is true that other students, who were too manly to dance as puppets on such ignoble strings, came indignantly to our rescue, that by them the gates were wrenched open and we protected in our return to our homes. But none the less was it evident that some new influence (wholly distinct from any intrinsic facts) had been at work. I will not say that the rioters were acting under orders, but neither can I disbelieve what I was told by indignant gentlemen in the medical class—that this disgraceful scene would never have happened, nor would the petition have been got up at the same time, had it not been clearly understood that our opponents needed a weapon at the Infirmary Board. This I do know, that the riot was not wholly or mainly due to the students at Surgeons' Hall. I know that Dr. Christison's class assistant was one of the leading rioters—(hisses, and order)—and the foul language he used could only be excused on the supposition I heard that he was intoxicated. I do not say that Dr. Christison knew of or sanctioned his presence, but I do say that I think he would not have been there had he thought the doctor would have strongly objected to his presence.

"Dr. Christison.—I must again appeal to you, my Lord. I think the language used regarding my assistant is language that no one is entitled to use at such an assembly as this—(hear)—where a gentleman is not present to defend himself, and to say whether it be true or not. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I know my assistant is a thorough gentleman, otherwise he never would have been my assistant; and I appeal to you again, my Lord, whether language such as this is to be allowed in the mouth of any person. I am perfectly sure there is not one gentleman in the whole assembly who would have used such language in regard to an absentee.

"Miss Jex-Blake.—If Dr. Christison prefers—

"Dr. Christison.—I wish nothing but that this foul language shall be put an end to.

"The Lord Provost.—I do not know what the foul language is. She merely said that in her opinion—

"Dr. Christison.—In her opinion the gentleman was intoxicated.

"Miss Jex-Blake.—I did not say he was intoxicated. I said I was told he was.

"The Lord Provost.—Withdraw the word 'intoxicated.'

"Miss Jex-Blake.—I said it was the only excuse for his conduct. If Dr. Christison prefers that I should say he used the language when sober, I will withdraw the other supposition—(laughter)."—*Scotsman*, Jan. 3rd, 1871.

NOTE V, p. 109.

The correspondence respecting costs was as follows:—

(1) *From Miss Louisa Stevenson.*

"Dear Miss Jex-Blake,—I am deputed by a few friends—some of whom are known to you, and some not—to inquire whether you will allow us and others the pleasure of defraying the expenses thrown upon you by the late decision of the Court, as we feel that decision to be inconsistent with right and equity; and we desire in this manner to make an emphatic protest against it. We cannot but regard with much sorrow and indignation the riot which led to the lawsuit; but I trust you feel as do others, how greatly the disclosures of the trial increased the interest and sympathy already felt in your cause.—I am, dear Miss Jex-Blake, yours very sincerely, Louisa Stevenson."

(2) *From Miss Jex-Blake.*

"July 14, 1871.

"Dear Miss Stevenson,—I confess that, as a matter of personal feeling, I had much rather pay the costs in the late suit, than allow my friends to do so. Indeed I have no hesitation in saying that I could not accept the expenses from personal friends who taxed themselves to save me out of a personal feeling of friendship. But if, on the other hand, there is, as I understand you to say, a strong feeling of indignation at the late decision in the abstract, and if the public as such are really desirous to protest against this by defraying the expenses, I feel that I have no right to reject so very valuable a testimony on behalf of myself and others. I am sure I do not need to say in words how grateful I feel to you and those others, whether personally known to me or not, who are coming forward so generously in this matter to espouse the weaker side, and that just at a moment when we are made to feel keenly how strong an influence is exercised by our opponents.—Believe me, yours very sincerely,

"Sophia Jex-Blake."

In returning thanks for the costs so generously repaid to me, I said:—

"I was perhaps guilty of some carelessness in selecting the words I used at the Infirmary meeting, and, doubtless, a more precise knowledge of legal definitions would have saved me some subsequent trouble that resulted from the simply straightforward way in which I spoke. And here, perhaps, you will allow me to say one word on a point respecting which I should extremely regret the slightest misconception among you, and those you represent, who are now honouring me with this expression of sympathy and confidence. I refer to the fact, of which so much was made in certain quarters, that I did not at the trial maintain the plea of 'Veritas.' I should be sorry, indeed, if any one could think that this omission implied the slightest avowal on my part that I knew myself to have been guilty of any libel against the youth who so rashly challenged my statements, with what result to his own credit you all know. It is true that in my original speech I spoke in ignorance that in the eye of the law no distinction exists between asserting a thing as a matter of fact, and mentioning it expressly as a matter of hearsay. You will remember how carefully I guarded myself by repeating

twice over on a certain point,—'I do not say that it was so; I say that I was told so.' It was mainly due to this legal technicality that, with great reluctance, I acquiesced in the desire of my lawyers that I should not maintain the issue of 'Veritas,' as had been my strong wish and intention; nor should I have yielded even then had I not been positively assured by them that the absence of this plea would in no way interfere with my bringing all the facts to light, and proving to the public exactly what grounds I had for my statements. You know that the judge ruled otherwise at the trial, and it is of course impossible for me to say whether he, on the one hand, or my counsel, including the Lord Advocate, on the other, were legally correct. It is useless for me now to regret that I allowed myself to be overruled on this matter by the statement made to me of the legal technicalities, and I think that the event of this day shows that I have in truth no need to regret the course of events. I believe that no one left the Court, and I trust no one will leave this room, without a firm conviction that my one desire was for a full and thorough investigation of all the facts of the case; and I leave it for you to decide how far the same desire was manifested by the pursuer, who would not even enter the witness-box until compelled by my counsel to do so."

—*Scotsman*, Oct. 10, 1871.

The following letter, written, I understand, by a lawyer, is worth quoting from the *Aberdeen Journal*:—

"SIR,—No one can read the proceedings in the case *Craig* v. *Jex-Blake*—in the Court of Session, before Lord Mure and a jury (1st June 1871)—without being struck with the anomalous state of the law of libel. The pursuer comes into Court, alleging that his character has been slandered and defamed. That, of course, implies that he is free from blame in regard to the matters about which the slanderous words were spoken. The defender, on the other hand, denies the libel—that is, in general terms, that the words uttered are not slanderous, or that she was justified in using them, as they were pertinent to the subject under discussion when she used them, and so were not slanderous. But she does not choose to say so, upon the record—that is, in other words, she does not choose to reiterate the slander, if it is slander, or, if it is not, to be guilty of what is really slander, because untrue and unjustifiable; and for this forbearance on her part, for this delicacy of sentiment and conduct, she is, forsooth, prevented from proving what the pursuer said or did, under certain circumstances which would fully justify the expression used. Is this state of things consistent with law and justice? I should say not. When a person comes into Court complaining of being slandered and abused, it is understood that he comes into Court with clean hands. When a man in such circumstances complains to the public, and comes into Court for redress, he puts his character into the scales, and it ought to be fairly weighed. He ought not to be allowed to shelter himself under a technical objection, when all the time he knows in his heart and conscience that he is complaining of his actual doings as slanderous—when he knows they are true, and that they are no slander.

"We have a good rule in our Scotch criminal law, applicable to subjects such as these. A man is accused of murder, and he pleads 'not guilty.' When the trial comes on, he is not prohibited from asking questions to prove that he is not guilty of murder, but that what he did was *in self-defence*, and that he had not only great provocation, but that the deceased struck the first blow, and put his (the defender's) life in imminent danger. On the contrary, the judges in all criminal cases pronounce a special interlocutor of what is called relevancy, allowing the panel (so the accused is named) to prove all relevant facts and circumstances tending to elide (that is to set aside) the libel. And why should it not be so in cases of libel for defamation of character? The cases are quite parallel—one for killing a man, the other for killing a man's reputation—in many cases more dear to him than his life.

"This state of the law is quite deplorable. The learned judge who tried the case of *Craig* v. *Jex-Blake* quite appreciated the incongruity when he observed to the jury that, under the issue as framed, it was his duty to tell them that they must assume, as the pursuer's counsel contended, that the expressions used were false, because the defendant had not undertaken to prove that they were true, that is, that it was the duty of a man not only to defend expressions used in the heat of debate, or in support of an object of importance in which he was interested, but also that he must go out of his way to reiterate the calumny, if it was a calumny. This is like school boys and girls saying to one another—'I said it, and I will prove it too.' It is no wonder though his Lordship added 'that it might seem *odd* to the jury that such a rule should exist;' and the only apology his Lordship could make for it was 'that it was a rule laid down by judges of great eminence, and had been acted upon in this country for a long series of years.' Nothing could be more preposterous or absurd. Another ground of defence, which seems to be excluded if the defendant does not put upon record the *veritas convicii*—the truth of the alleged slander, is that of 'privilege.' Thus, where a man acts along with others in a conjoint concern, and a dispute occurs about the execution of it, it would seem quite justifiable to maintain that words spoken, though seeming to affect the character of the parties, or any of them, should be called 'privileged'—that is, not subject to prosecu-

tion if uttered in vindication of a principle, or pertinent to the circumstances under which the quarrel arose, or occasioned by the conduct of any of the parties. If this principle is not observed, or if a defender is not allowed to prove the conduct of the pursuer, who comes seeking redress for the wrong alleged to be done, then the most manifest injustice may be occasioned to the innocent, and the law becomes a shelter and a protection to the guilty. Nor is this the only penalty that the public pays for the law of libel in its present shape. It is imperative, it seems, for the jury to return a verdict for some damages; and in the case we have been considering—*Craig* v. *Jex-Blake*—the jury returned a verdict virtually acquitting the defender of the alleged injury, and certifying that the pursuer had sustained no injury to his character, or, if any, that it could not be valued higher than the smallest coin of the realm—'one farthing.' But there is another certificate to be granted by the judge, that as the case affected 'character,' it was proper to have it tried in the Supreme Court, and that this 'farthing' of damages carries along with it the appalling conviction that the defender must pay not only her own expenses, but the pursuer's, to the tune of several hundred pounds. Why not put it into the power of the jury 'to find no damages due,' as in a criminal case the accused is found 'not guilty.' Then when damages were found due, the case would be dear, and expenses follow as a matter of course; *ex adverso*, where *none* were found due, the defender would be relieved of expenses on both sides, and thus justice would be done, and the public law vindicated. It is hoped that matters will not be allowed to rest as they are, and that, as we have many Acts to amend Acts, the law of libel will be amended on principles somewhat consonant with commonsense and justice.—Ex-Juridicus."

NOTE W, p. 112.

"Edinburgh, July 13, 1871.

"Sir,—I see that a juryman has written to you to say how very ill the recent decision as to costs agrees with the intentions of the jury, and a lawyer has made clear how extraordinary it is in point of law. Will you allow me to say a few words, from personal experience, on the practical results? The medical students of Edinburgh have received a hint by which some of them seem well inclined to profit. They have been told pretty plainly that it is possible that there should be a riot got up for the express purpose of insulting women, for one of the very women insulted to be accused of libel when she complains of such conduct, and then for the insulters to escape scot-free, and the complainer to be mulcted in expenses. In fact, the moral seems to be that, unless a woman is willing to be saddled with costs, to the amount of several hundred pounds, she had better resolve to submit to every kind of insult, without even allowing herself to mention the facts.

"I say that some of the students appear to have taken the hint so given; for to this I must think is due the treatment received by myself and some of my friends if we happen to meet students on our way home in the evening. It will possibly strike some people as sufficiently extraordinary that a knot of young men find pleasure in following a woman through the streets, and should take advantage of her being alone to shout after her all the foulest epithets in their very voluminous vocabulary of abuse; yet such is the case. I am quite aware that it would be useless to represent to those students the injury they do to the University and to the medical profession in the eyes of the public, because neither of these considerations would weigh with them for a moment; but it may make some impression upon them to be told that the effect of their conduct is really such as they would least desire. Dr. Christison is reported to have said during his examination in Court, that he considered the riot of November 18th to be a 'great misfortune,' and from his point of view he was undoubtedly right. If the wish of these students is to bar our progress, and frighten us from the prosecution of the work we have taken in hand, I venture to say never was a greater mistake made. Each fresh insult is an additional incentive to finish the work begun. I began the study of medicine merely from personal motives; now I am also impelled by the desire to remove women from the care of such young ruffians. I am quite aware that respectable students will say, and say truly, that these are the dregs of the profession, and that they will never take a high place as respectable practitioners; such is, doubtless, the case; but what then? Simply that, instead of having the medical charge of ladies with rich husbands and fathers, to whom, from self-interest, they would be respectful, they will have the treatment of unprotected servants and shop-girls. I should be very sorry to see any poor girl under the care (?) of such men as those, for instance, who the other night followed me through the street, using medical terms to make the disgusting purport of their language more intelligible to me. When a man can put his scientific knowledge to such degraded use, it seems to me he cannot sink much lower.

"How far the recent decisions are calculated to arrest or encourage such conduct, I leave the public to judge.—I am, etc., Mary Edith Pechey."

—*Scotsman*, July 14th, 1871.

NOTE X, p. 112.

THE SONG OF THE NEUTRAL.

" When can I again invite
Friend of mine
To come and dine,
Without danger of a fight,
Without danger that the party
Change its tone from frank and hearty
To the angry tone of strife,
As the theme so quarrel-rife
Croppeth up amidst the talk
(As weeds crop up across a walk)
Of the doctors and the ladies?

" When Christison resigns his Chair,
And Andrew Wood is with the blest;
When the doctors cease from troubling,
And the ladies are at rest.
. . . . . .

" When can I again subscribe
Gold or note,
And buy a vote,
Without danger that a tribe
Of canvassers will call on me,
To talk of the Infirmary.
Of female student *versus* male,
Of classes mixed, a horrid tale,
And beg my vote against the ladies?

" When Christison resigns his Chair.
And Andrew Wood is with the blest:
When the doctors cease from troubling,
And the ladies are at rest."

—*Scotsman*, Jan. 19, 1872.

NOTE Y, p. 113.

The results of the winter session 1869-70 have been given in the text. During the succeeding summer session all the lady students (six in number) appeared in the prize lists in both classes which they attended, viz. Botany and Natural History. During the next winter, 1870-71, the classes taken were Anatomy and Surgery. Out of seven ladies, three were in honours in Anatomy (one of them in two departments), and four in Surgery. During the summer of 1871 there were five lady medical students in the Botany Class, and of these three appeared in the prize lists—one of them in two departments. During the winter 1871-72, nine ladies attended Chemistry, and, of these, seven appeared in first-class honours, Miss Pechey, in this her second course, obtaining 100 per cent.; nine also attended Physiology, and, of these, two obtained first-class and three second-class honours; six being also in honours in Practical Physiology.

It must be understood that, in the above statement, I have included only those ladies who were regular students of medicine; other ladies, on several occasions, joined the classes, and also appeared in the prize lists.

NOTE Z, pp. 115, 136.

The case, drawn up by order of the Committee and submitted to Counsel, contained the facts relating to the Edinburgh lady students which are narrated in the text, and further proceeded, as follows :—

"... It is stated in Maitland's *History of Edinburgh* that the first mention of erecting a College in Edinburgh was found in the will of Robert Reid, Bishop of Orkney, who, dying in 1558, bequeathed eight thousand Scottish merks towards founding a College 'for the education of youth.'

"In the subsequent benefactions and charters granted by Queen Mary in 1566, and by King James in 1582, no stipulation is made as to the sex of the students for whose benefit the College was to be established; and in 1583 proclamation was made inviting 'all who were inclined to become scholars therein' to enter their names in a certain book opened for the purpose.

"The older University of Glasgow was founded under a Bull granted by Pope Nicholas V. at the suit of James II. of Scotland, and in this Bull it was expressly stated that the University of Bologna was to be followed as a model, and that the doctors, masters, and students of Glasgow were to enjoy all the privileges and rights possessed by those of Bologna. There is abundant historic evidence that women were never excluded from the University of Bologna, but frequently studied and took degrees there during the Middle Ages, and that no less than seven women at different times filled professorial chairs in this University, three of them being in the Medical Faculty, viz. :—

"Dorotea Bucca, Professor of Medicine, early in the fifteenth century; Anna Morandi Mazzolini, Professor of Anatomy, 1750; Maria Della Donne, Professor of Midwifery, 1810.

"It appears that the University of Edinburgh was founded generally on the same model, and the University Calendar states that 'in 1621 an Act was passed by the Scotch Parliament which ratified to the University, in ample form, all the rights, immunities, and privileges enjoyed by other Universities in the kingdom.

"There does not appear, in any of the statutes or ordinances subsequently issued, any regulation that male students alone should attend the University; nor in the recent Act of 1858 is there any such regulation. As a matter of fact, no applications for admission to the University of Edinburgh seem to have been made by women until the year 1869, as above mentioned.

"In the Universities (Scotland) Act of 1858, section 12, power was given to the University Court 'to effect improvements in the internal arrangements of the University, after due communication with the Senatus Academicus, and with the sanction of the Chancellor, provided that all such proposed improvements shall be submitted to the University Council for their consideration.'

"By the same Act (section 21), provision was made for 'providing additional teaching by means of assistants to the Professors in any professorships already established or to be established,' and several assistants were accordingly appointed by the Commissioners under the Act; and, subsequently, the Senatus appointed certain other assistants, and made them allowances out of the University revenues. None of these assistants have, however, hitherto delivered courses of lectures qualifying for graduation, though there does not appear to be any clause in the Act which forbids their doing so. The only course of instruction qualifying for medical graduation which is given entirely by an assistant is that of practical chemistry.

"During the illness or absence of professors, temporary substitutes to lecture in their stead have frequently been appointed by the Senatus, with the sanction of the University Court."

The following Queries were not all asked in the first instance, but in part on a subsequent occasion (see p. 136); as, however, they were all submitted on the same case, and concern the same subject, I give them here consecutively, arranged in the order in which the opinions obtained thereon were presented to the Senatus or University Court :—

"*Query* 1.—In the permission given to women to study 'for the profession of medicine' in the University of Edinburgh (bearing date November 12, 1869), was it involved in clauses 1, 2, and 6, that they should be allowed to pass the ordinary professional examinations and to proceed to the degree of M.D. in the University, subject only to the restrictions laid down in the said regulations; and is it therefore incumbent on the Medical Faculty to admit them to the necessary examinations to the extent of the subjects in which they are already qualified to pass?

"*Opinion.*—Reading the regulations referred to in connection with the resolutions of the

Medical Faculty which were approved of by the Senatus, the University Court, and the General Council, we think that their import and meaning is that, subject to the restrictions laid down in the regulations, women shall be allowed not merely to qualify themselves for the ordinary professional examinations with a view to obtain a medical degree in the University, but also, when so qualified, to be admitted to these examinations. We are, therefore, of opinion that it is the duty of the Medical Faculty to admit them to examination accordingly.

"*Query* 2.—If this was not involved, is it in the power of the Senatus, either alone, or in conjunction with the University Court, to accord the required permission to admit them to professional examination with a view to graduation?

"*Opinion.*—Upon the ground of keeping faith with the women who have, in reliance upon the regulations and in compliance with the terms thereby prescribed, qualified themselves for professional examination with a view to graduation, we are of opinion that the Senatus is entitled to direct that they shall be admitted to examination; and we also think that, without any further direction or authority than the regulations necessarily imply, the Medical Faculty is entitled to admit them to examination.

"*Queries* 3 and 4.—Is it competent for the Senatus, either directly or in conjunction with the other University authorities, to appoint special lecturers to deliver qualifying courses of lectures to women who are matriculated and registered students of medicine, when such instruction cannot be obtained from the professors of the special subjects in question? Is it competent for the Senatus or other University authorities so far to relax the ordinary regulations with respect to extra-mural classes, as to authorize women to attend outside the University those courses of lectures which are denied to them by the Professors within the walls, such courses being held to qualify for graduation beyond the number of *four*, as contemplated in the present regulations?

"*Opinion.*—If the existing regulations with respect to graduation in medicine stand upon statutes passed by the University Commissioners, whose powers have now expired, it is competent for the University Court to alter them with the written consent of the Chancellor and with the approval of Her Majesty in Council. This is provided by section 19 of the Act of 1858. If they stand on the authority of the Court, or of any other power in the University itself, we should think that they may be altered by the University Court under section 12 of the Act, 'after due communication with the Senatus Academicus, and with the sanction of the Chancellor,' but with the proviso that the proposed alteration 'shall be submitted to the University Council for their consideration.' In one or other of these ways it appears to us that any provision which may be deemed necessary, or proper and reasonable, for enabling women to complete their medical studies, with a view to graduation, may be made.

"*Query* 5.—Whether the Senatus, University Court, University Council and Chancellor, had collectively the power of granting to women the permission to matriculate as students as they did in 1869, and whether the regulations issued officially (November 12, 1869) are valid as regards such matriculation?

"*Opinion.*—We are of opinion that the University Court, in virtue of the powers conferred upon it by the 12th section (2) of the Act 1858, have power, after communication with the Senatus, and with the sanction of the Chancellor, and after the University Council have considered the subject, to grant permission to women (as they did in 1869) to matriculate as students, and the resolutions of the Court in that year are valid.

"*Query* 6.—Whether the medical Professors are exonerated from obligation to teach, in some way or other, all matriculated students, by the fact, that, in clause 3 of the regulations quoted above, it is merely stated that they 'shall be permitted to have separate classes for women'?

"*Opinion.*—The University Court having statutory powers to 'effect' improvements in the 'internal arrangements of the University,' and it being within their power, under this enactment, to allow women to be educated at the University, we are of opinion that this resolution must be carried out in good faith and obeyed by the Professors. The third resolution of the University Court of November 1869, which '*permits*' the Professors to have separate classes for women, in no way derogates from the resolution of the Court that women 'shall be admitted to the study of medicine.'

"*Query* 7.—In case such women as are matriculated students of medicine in the University are refused instruction by the individual medical Professors, what is their legal mode of redress, and against whom should it be directed?

"*Opinion.*—We are of opinion that the University Court can compel, by action, the medical Professors to obey the resolutions of November 1869, by holding separate classes for the education of women. *With respect to the title of the women, we think that those of them who have matriculated and passed the preliminary examinations have a title, and may enforce their rights by action. The proper form of Action is, we think, a Declarator against the Professors refusing to obey the resolution of the University Court, with petitory conclusions to the effect that*

they should be ordained to hold separate classes for the instruction of the pursuers, they receiving their due remuneration.

"*Query* 8.—Whether, in the first constitution or charter of the University, or in any of the subsequent statutes, there is anything which limits the benefits of the University to male students?

"*Opinion.*—The Charter of Erection and Confirmation of the 'College of Edinburgh,' by King James VI., dated 14th April 1582, granted certain lands and revenues to the Magistrates and Town Council of Edinburgh, with a licence to employ those revenues, and such others as well-disposed persons might bestow on them, in the erecting of suitable buildings for the use of professors and 'scholars' of grammar, humanity, and languages, philosophy, theology, medicine, and laws, and other liberal sciences. The King, by this charter (as interpreted by decision of the Courts), delegated to, or conferred upon, the Magistrates and Town Council the character of patron and founder of this new seminary of education. The powers of superintendence and control thus conferred upon the Magistrates and Council remained with them till the Act of 1858 was passed, by which the more important powers were transferred to the University Court. The Magistrates and Council never conferred upon the College any independent constitution, so as to enable the members of it to exercise any power of internal government. As founders, patrons, and delegates intrusted by the royal grant, the Magistrates and Council remained in the full right of management, regulation, and tutelage of their own institution.

"An Act of Parliament was passed in 1621 (c. 79), which may be considered as the charter of erection of the University. It narrates the charter of 1582, and the licence thereby given to found a College and choose Professors, and sets forth the King's zeal for the growth of learning, and his purpose to grant the College all immunities enjoyed by other colleges. The statute then confirms the erection of the College, and ratifies all the mortifications made to the town by the King or others towards its support. It bestows on the College the name of 'King James' College,' and grants to the Magistrates 'in favour of the said burgh of Edinburgh, patrons of the said College, and of the College, and of rectors, regents, bursars, and *students* within the same, all liberties, freedoms, immunities, and privileges pertaining to a free College, and that in as ample a form and large manner as any College has or bruickis within His Majesty's realm.'

"The statute concludes with ordaining a new charter to issue, if need be, for erecting the College, with all such privileges and immunities. No such charter was ever issued; but the statute itself may be held equivalent to a charter. It was a charter in favour of the Magistrates and Council as founders and patrons, and in no way prejudiced, but on the contrary confirmed their power of superintendence, control, and regulation of all matters concerning the internal government of the University.

"We are of opinion that, in virtue of the powers they thus possess, the Magistrates and Town Council could at any time, during their 266 years of University rule, have done what the University Court did in 1869—grant permission to women to be educated at the University.

"On examining the records, we find that the superintendence of the patrons was active and constant. They made, at various times during the two centuries and a half while their jurisdiction lasted, sets of laws and regulations for the College, which embrace all things connected with the duties and rights of professors and students, the series and order of studies, the days and hours of lecture, the books to be read, the conduct of students in and out of College hours, the modes of trial and graduation, the attendance of the professors at their classes, attendance at church, dress to be worn by students, fees to be paid, etc., etc.

"All these regulations proceed on the footing that only male students attended the University; many of them were inapplicable to females, and we cannot find any trace of its being contemplated by the patrons that females might be students. And we do not find any evidence of a female having attended the University.

"Therefore, while we are of opinion that the Magistrates and Council had the power to pass a regulation authorizing the attendance of women at the University, and to compel the professors to teach them, yet as they never passed any such regulation, no woman could have insisted upon admission to University education as a legal right prior to 1869.

"The University Court, by sec. 12 (2), are now vested with all the powers of internal management and regulation formerly possessed by the Magistrates and Council; they have done what the latter never did, although they lawfully might. They have, by their resolution of November 1869, given to women the right to demand, equally with male students, admission to the University."

NOTE AA, p. 116.

"The extraordinary history of the vicissitudes endured by the lady students seems at last to have reached its most extraordinary phase. It appears, as stated in our columns of yester-

day, that on Saturday last the Medical Faculty of the College—a body which, collectively, forms one of the law-makers of the College—passed a vote by a majority whereby they instructed their Dean deliberately to break a law of the University, or rather expressly 'interdicted' him from complying with it. What makes the matter the more remarkable is that this special law was in the first instance inaugurated by themselves, and subsequently approved by the Senatus and other authorities, and incorporated in the official regulations published in the 'Calendar.' . . . It would seem clear enough that a decision which had been deliberately confirmed by each university authority successively, and which had thus become law, could not be disturbed by any one except after an equally formal process of revocation. It is, however, well known that, though all the bodies enumerated passed the above regulations by a majority, there was in most cases a dissatisfied minority, who wished that all privileges should be withheld from the lady students. It would have surprised no one to hear that a formal attempt had been made to obtain the withdrawal of the privileges conferred; but the public were probably sufficiently astonished to learn yesterday that, though no such open and honourable attempt had been made, a secret *coup d'état* was planned, by which it was apparently hoped, at the very last moment, when no appeal to the Senatus or other authorities was possible, to crush the hopes of the medical ladies, at least for the present year. At the Faculty meeting to which we have referred, a vote was actually passed to 'interdict' the Dean, whose friendliness to the ladies was well known, from giving to any women who were about to join the medical class the papers necessary to enable them to pass the preliminary examination in Arts, which is indispensable before registration—this examination having been not only previously allowed, but actually passed by numerous ladies on no less than four occasions! At this same notable meeting, a vote was also passed that the Medical Faculty should disregard alike their own previous resolutions, the official regulations of the 'Calendar,' and the tickets of admission already paid for and obtained by those other ladies who are now ready to proceed to their first professional examination; and, accordingly, a letter was sent to each of these three ladies, informing them that their tickets had been granted 'in error,' and that they could not be examined 'without the sanction of the Senatus Academicus,' as if that sanction had not been already given in the most emphatic manner!

"The story is not a pleasant one. That a minority, obliged to acquiesce in an act of liberality on the part of the majority, should, when unable to prevail by fair means, endeavour to compass their end by a side-wind and in an underhand manner, is sufficiently discreditable; but that, rather than relinquish their own dogged resolution to obstruct the ladies, these Professors should deliberately abstain from all previous warning of the means they intended to employ—should allow many months of severe study to be passed with a definite aim and hope, and should then silently dig a pitfall at the very threshold of the door through which the ladies must pass, and hope, by an arbitrary exercise of authority against a few wholly unprepared women, completely to destroy their prospects, for the present year at least—is something almost too monstrous to be believed, did the circumstances admit of any doubt in the matter. Whether these medical gentlemen really supposed that, by their unsupported fiat, they could set aside all the existing regulations of the University, or whether they trusted to the ladies' want of knowledge in legal matters not to challenge their authority, it is of course impossible to say, but one would rather believe in the ignorance of law implied by the former alternative, than in the lamentable want of honourable feeling that would be conveyed in the latter. Be this as it may, it is not easy to exaggerate the damaging effect that a story of this kind is likely to have on the minds of the public. That such a line of conduct *could* be planned and carried out by a body of men claiming the name of gentlemen, and belonging to a profession that calls itself 'liberal' and 'learned,' is perhaps as striking a proof as could be given of the fatally blinding influence of professional prejudice and unreasoning trade-unionism."

—*Scotsman*, Oct. 20, 1872.

"We confess that the conduct of the Medical Faculty amazes us. Can they suppose that such obstructions are calculated to stop the movement? Why should they not show a little practical sense, and choose their fighting-ground with reasonable judgment? A single Professor, whose classes must be attended according to present regulations, might have hoped successfully to resist the demand that he should teach mixed classes. There are many people who do not look with particular complacency upon the efforts of a few ladies to obtain a place in the medical profession; but paltry persecutions like these, and little dodges sprung upon them suddenly, will assuredly turn the popular tide in their favour. The medical profession seem to think that they have only got to get behind these too devoted students, and shout 'bo!' loud enough to frighten them out of their five wits. They might surely have known Miss Jex-Blake better by this time. Are the Edinburgh Medical Faculty really afraid of the competition of the ladies? Do they look upon them as 'knob-sticks,' against whom the doors must be closed in spite of law, reason, and liberty? They are welcome to their fears—narrow as they are—and to their opinions on the question of lady doctors; but we trust that the University of Edinburgh will see that its regulations are maintained. Having given permission to females to study medicine under conditions which are strict enough, and even somewhat

hard, the University must prevent any combination of Professors from taking the matter into their own hands, and debarring the ladies from the privileges for which they have so gallantly fought. In the meantime, we congratulate the five ladies on the prompt spirit in which they have repelled the insidious attempt of a majority of the Medical Faculty—we believe only a very small majority—to cut their studies short. We need not urge them to persevere, for they seem to have that 'faculty' in predominance, but we think we can assure them that every victory that they gain, and every defeat that they suffer, adds to the number of their sympathizers, and breaks down no inconsiderable portion of the mountain of prejudice that they had to face when they commenced their career as students. If the medical Professors want to defeat them, they must get better advisers and not court humiliation. Their present counsellor is like Adversity, ugly and venomous in appearance only. Without the 'precious jewel,' the treasure of ill-judged and unreasonable persecutions, which he carries in his head, the little forlorn hope of courageous ladies, whose ranks are thinned from time to time by marriage and other maladies, would hardly be so likely to plant their triumphant flag on the top of the Castle Rock at last."—*Glasgow Herald*, October 20, 1871.

NOTE BB, p. 127.

The following verses (written by a male medical student) are no bad indication of the popular feeling respecting the incidents narrated above, and this is rendered the more characteristic by the national form in which it finds expression :—

THE BARRIN' O' OOR DOOR.

(*A New Version o' an Auld Sang.*)

Dedicated without special permission to Sir Robert Christison, Bart., and intended to be sung at the next convivial meeting of the "Infirmary Ring."

By Gamaliel Gowkgrandiose, M.D.

It fell aboot the New-Year time,
And a gay time it was then oh !
That the lady students in oor auld toon
Had a fecht wi' us medical men oh !
Chorus—Aboot the barrin' o' oor door weel ! weel ! weel !
The barrin' o' oor door weel !

When first they cam' tae learn oor craft,
We laughed at them in oor sleeve oh !
That women could e'er gang on wi' sic wark,
What medical man could believe oh !
Chorus—For the barrin', &c.

So we pouched a' the fees they gied tae us
For lecture or for Exam. oh !
We fleeced them a' as clean and as bare
As was ever a sheep or a lamb oh !
Chorus—A' for the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

But when we found they meant to use
The knowledge for which they had paid oh !
And on the trade o' us medical men
Micht mak' a furious raid oh !
Chorus—We began the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

Hech, sirs, tae drive thae women awa'
Was a job baith sair and teuch, sirs ;
It gied Sir Robert and Andrew Wood
Vexation and bother eneuch, sirs.
Chorus—Did the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

Oor students got up a bonny bit mob
To gie the ladies a fright, sirs ;
Wi' physical force Young Physic did work
Tae get us oot o' oor plight, sirs.
Chorus—And help the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

We frightened the douce Infirmary folks
Wi' stories o' classes mixed, sirs;
They werena just true—but what o' that?
We a' hae oor ain trade tricks, sirs.
Chorus—For the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

Scandals we spread owre a' the toon
Against the ladies' guid fame, sirs;
We drove them frae the Infirmary gate,
Though some citizen fools cried "Shame," sirs.
Chorus—For the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

But they lived a' scurrilous scandals doon
Wi' true feminine perversity;
They roused the folk owre a' oor town
'Gainst oor clique in the University.
Chorus—For the barrin o' oor door, &c.

A year gaed by, and then they tried
Again tae force their way, sirs,
Into the wards we've sworn maun be oors
Until oor dying day, sirs.
Chorus—For the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

Sir Robert bullied and cracked his big whip,
And Turner put on the screw, sirs;
Yet we a' got beaten that New-Year's Day,
For the ladies' friends stood true, sirs.
Chorus—Oh! the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

Sir Robert looked blue when he heard o' the vote,
And Turner he tore his hair, sirs;
He forgot there wasna muckle to tear,
Sae deep was his despair, sirs.
Chorus—Aboot the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

And Andrew Wood fell into the airms
O' twa o' his "five fair sons," sirs;
"Puir bairns," quo' he, "we'll a' starve noo,
For oor craft will be over-run, sirs."
Chorus—Oh! the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

And Nicholson whimpered wi' clerical whine,
And Muirhead shook his fists, sirs,
As he thocht o' how the *Scotsman* wad chaff
O' the class he had that day missed, sirs.
Chorus—And the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

Lister wept owre his petulant speech,
When he swore he'd resign his chair, sirs,
If women entered the hospital wards—
Eh! noo he repented him sair, sirs.
Chorus—For the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

But when we cam to oor senses a',
We planned a bonny bit plan, sirs,
Tae quash the votes o' thae merchant firms
That supported the ladies' men, sir.
Chorus—For the barrin' o' oor door, &c.

The firms may leave us—we carena a straw;
The Infirmary may sink, sirs;
If we may but keep females aff oor preserve,
We carena what folk think, sirs.
Chorus—O' the barrin' o' oor door, &c

The Infirmary meeting against us gaed,
But the Court o' Session befriends us
Oot o' the hospital managing board
Neither women nor traders shall send us
Chorus—For the barrin' o' oor door &c

Confusion, then, let each man drink
To the ladies and their supporters, sirs;
For Monopoly's rights let us a' fecht or fa',
Or be brayed up small in oor mortars, sirs!
Chorus—Ho! for the barrin' o' oor door weel! weel! weel!
The barrin' o' oor door weel!

—*Scotsman*, Feb. 13, 1872

NOTE CC, p. 134.

"Darwin may be wrong in holding that 'the struggle for existence' is a universal condition, but no one can deny it as a truth in all matters purely human. Nothing obtains recognition until it fights for it; nothing is established until it conquers its enemies in battle. Everything new has hosts of enemies simply because it is new . . . Trades-unionism is as universal as trades and professions, and from the bishop to the scavenger all men are hornets if you propose to touch their purse. The claims of women for medical education, and the right to use that professionally, are thus opposed to all the common prejudices of the unreflecting, and this dead weight must be lifted before the claims will be admitted. But the bitterest fighting is with the professional doctors, whose craft seems in danger, and who have put on the whole armour of hornets to fight the women on this question.

"The doctors do not confess that their object is monopoly of a lucrative profession. Oh no! they wish to preserve the morals of society, maintain medical standards that will ensure scientific treatment of disease. But this does not impose on many, any more than the cant of the operative, who wishes his wages raised to put him on a more respectable social status, while he is thinking all the while how many extra pints of beer he is to gain by the change. . . . The daily newspapers enabled most people to judge of that quarrel between love of money and bull-dog prejudice on the one hand, and female courage and power of intellect on the other. But in this essay we have the whole stages of the strife fairly sketched in historic shape, and supported by such documentary and other proof as cannot be gainsaid. It is in a form that can be preserved to illustrate the philosophy extant in the most conceited university of this highly enlightened age. It is amusing to see so much imbecility and so much malignity struggling under the incisive attack of one courageous lady; and when the battle has been entirely won, this record of friends and foes will be an excellent memorial of the struggle."—*Border Advertiser*, Aug. 30, 1872.

"And if we now turn to the second of Miss Jex-Blake's essays, still more apparent does it become that the real obstacle which medical women have to surmount, in fitting themselves for practice is the undisguised self-interestedness of medical men,—we do not say of all medical men, for that would be a shameful libel on many noble-minded gentlemen, but we fear that their feeling as a class is against the admission of women to the privileges they enjoy, simply because they are privileges, that like all other monopolists they are extremely jealous to preserve their monopoly. It is very painful, after realizing to oneself the terrible amount of silent suffering to which many women are condemned, and the obvious means of alleviating it which nature presents and custom rejects, in the skilled attendance of other women, to read this story of the effort which a few high-minded ladies made to qualify themselves legally for such a position. It is almost impossible to read that history, so simply told, without allowing righteous indignation to get so far the better of the calm serenity which befits the writer of a review, as to transport one altogether beyond the bounds of criticism; and we shall not therefore enter on it further here, than by saying that there was no obstacle, from brutal violence to the meanest and most contemptible artifice, which was not remorselessly employed against these patient and charitable souls. How nobly, with what courage, fortitude, incomparable ability and Christian forbearance, they received and repulsed these ignoble attacks, is all written here, a tale to make a strong man weep, to crown those lady actors in it with undying fame. Surely that work must be blessed, which had power in the persons of not half-a-dozen gentlewomen to resist so inveterate and malignant a persecution. The slanders generated in the prurient and distempered fancies of evil-minded old men, unhappily placed in positions of authority, were not the only, though they probably were the cruellest, insults which they had to bear; even personal violence was not spared them, and it is with a thrill of absolute horror we read of young men, students of a university, in the 19th century, assailing with mud and stones, and, still worse, with foul and filthy epithets, this heroic band of inoffensive and defenceless ladies. We wonder, in reading of it, if these ruffians had sisters of their own, and if so, what sort of a reception did they receive from them on their return from their academic studies. We would not wrong the most degraded woman that exists, by believing that she would willingly associate on terms of intimacy with such cowardly and despicable persons. And why all this malignity and brutal ruffianism? Simply

because a few ladies sought to devote themselves, with legal sanctions, to the holy office of alleviating the sufferings of others.

"We lay down the volume which records these pitiable facts with sincere humility, and sad consciousness of how little impression has yet been made, with all our boasted improvements, on that dense stratum of savage coarseness which underlies the tinsel and glitter of modern social refinement, and which, like the elements of volcanic eruption, ever and anon horrifies us by forcing itself to the surface, spreading from the mountain tops of civilisation to the obscurest valleys and channels beneath. We lay it down also, however, with the conviction that, even as the evil is vast, so should those who would give it battle be resolute, and with a revived determination for our own part not to shrink from the affray."

—*Liverpool Social Reformer*, February 1, 1873.

NOTE DD, p. 140.

This correspondence is so remarkable that I subjoin it entire.

(1.) *To the University Court.*

"15 Buccleuch Place, November 21, 1871.

"Gentlemen,—It is now two years since you passed a series of resolutions, dated 12th November 1869, to the effect that 'women shall be admitted to the study of medicine in the University.'

"In the time that has since elapsed, I and those ladies who matriculated with me at that date, have completed one-half of the studies necessary for graduation in the University of Edinburgh. Nearly five months ago, I ventured to point out to the Senatus Academicus that, unless further arrangements were made, it would be impossible for us to complete the studies which we have begun with your express sanction. After pointing out the existing difficulties, I ventured further to make two suggestions, either of which, if adopted, might enable us to complete our education in the University. In reply, however, I was informed that the Senatus, 'having taken the opinion of counsel with reference to the proposals contained in the memorial of date 26th June 1871, find themselves unable to comply with either of those proposals.'

"I understand, however, that since the date referred to, another legal opinion has been obtained from the Lord Advocate and Sheriff Fraser, and has been laid before the Senatus, and by them forwarded to your honourable Court. As, however, the Senatus still appear unwilling to initiate any measure by which we may be relieved from our present difficulties, I feel constrained now to appeal to you, in my own name and that of my fellow-students, to take such action as shall enable us to complete our studies.

"I beg to represent to you that we have all paid matriculation fees for the present year, and are by our tickets declared to be 'Cives Academiæ Edinensis,' and that yet we, who commenced our studies in 1869, are unable during the present session to obtain any further classes whatever towards completing our required course of study.

"We understand from those friends who have taken legal opinion on the subject—and doubtless such opinion will be laid before you simultaneously with this letter—that we are entitled to demand from the University the means of completing our studies, and that, failing any other alternative measures, we can claim the instruction of the Medical Professors to the extent needed to complete our curriculum.

"We beg, therefore, most respectfully to request that, unless any other mode of supplying our needs seems preferable to you, you will vouchsafe to ordain that the Professors, whose courses we are bound by the University regulations to attend, shall give us the requisite instruction.—I beg to subscribe myself, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

"Sophia Jex-Blake."

(2.) *Minute of University Court of January* 8, 1872.

"The University Court have had under consideration the letters of Miss Jex-Blake and Miss Louisa Stevenson, of 21st November 1871, and other relative documents laid before them on behalf of the women who have been admitted by the regulations of the Court of November 10th, 1869, to study medicine in the University.

"In these papers it is stated that certain Professors of the Faculty of Medicine have declined to give separate classes of instruction to women; and the Court are asked either (1) to extend, in the case of female medical students, the privilege granted by ordinance by the Universities' Commissioners, to lecturers, not being Professors in a university, of qualifying for graduation by their lectures, which privilege is now restricted to four of the prescribed

subjects of study; or (2) To authorize the appointment of special lecturers to give, in the University, qualifying courses of instruction in place of those Professors who decline to do so; or (3) To ordain that the Professors referred to shall themselves give the necessary courses of instruction to women.

"The second course suggested it is not in the power of the Court, or other University authorities, singly or jointly to adopt.

"The third course is equally beyond the power of the Court. The Act of 1858 vests in the Court plenary powers to deal with any Professor who shall fail to discharge his duties, but no Professor can be compelled to give courses of instruction other than those which, by the use and wont of the University, it has been the duty of the holders of his chair to deliver.

"The first of the proposed measures would imply an alteration in one of the ordinances for graduation in Medicine (No. 8, clause vi., 4). Such alteration could be made by the University Court only with the consent, expressed in writing, of the Chancellor, and with the approval of Her Majesty in Council.

"But to alter, in favour of female students, rules laid down for the regulation of graduation in Medicine, would imply an assumption on the part of the Court that the University of Edinburgh has the power of granting degrees to women. It seems to the Court impossible to them to assume the existence of a power that is questioned in many quarters, and which is both affirmed and denied by eminent counsel. So long as these doubts remain, it would, in the opinion of the Court, be premature to consider the expediency of taking steps to obtain, in favour of female students, an alteration of an ordinance which may be held not to apply to women.

"Though the Court are unable to comply with any of the specific requests referred to, they are at the same time desirous to remove, so far as possible, any present obstacle in the way of a complete medical education being given to women,—provided always that medical instruction to women be imparted in strictly separate classes.

"The Court are of opinion that the question under reference has been complicated by the introduction of the subject of graduation, which is not essential to the completion of a medical or other education. The University of London, which has a special charter for the examination of women, does not confer degrees upon women, but only grants them 'certificates of proficiency.' If the applicants in the present case would be content to seek the examination of women by the University for certificates of proficiency in Medicine, instead of University degrees, the Court believe that arrangements for accomplishing this object would fall within the scope of the powers given to them by section 12 of the Universities' (Scotland) Act. The Court would be willing to consider any such arrangements which might be submitted to them."

(3.) *To the University Court.*

"15 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh, January 18, 1872.

"Gentlemen,—I have received from your Secretary a copy of your minute of the 8th instant, and I beg you to allow me most respectfully, but at the same time most emphatically, to protest against the decision therein contained, on the following grounds:—

"1. That when women were admitted to study 'for the profession of medicine' in the University of Edinburgh, and were required to pay the ordinary matriculation fees as *Cives Academiæ Edinensis*, in addition to those for instruction, it was believed to be involved that, subject only to the restrictions laid down in the regulations of November 12, 1869, we should be allowed to complete our education, and should, as a matter of course, proceed to the degree of M.D., no official intimation to the contrary being given to us at the time, nor indeed until now, when we have half completed our University curriculum. You will allow me to remind you further, that we have very high legal authority for believing that these expectations were well founded, and that matriculation does involve necessarily all the privileges of studentship, including graduation, as was indeed recently admitted by a legal Professor, who has always been one of our most determined opponents, when addressing your honourable Court in favour of rescinding the present regulations.

"2. That, except with a view to ultimate graduation, it was quite meaningless to require us to pass, as we did, the preliminary examination in Arts, which has not any necessary connection with the study of medicine itself, but is expressly stated to be 'the first examination *for the medical degree*.'

"3. That we have all along pursued our studies with a view to the further professional examinations; that, in the resolutions passed by the Medical Faculty on July 1, 1869, it was distinctly stated that 'ladies be allowed to attend medical classes and to receive certificates of attendance qualifying for examination;' that, further, on April 9, 1870, the Senatus Academicus expressly ordained that exactly the same University certificates of attendance should be issued to students of both sexes, for the special purpose of qualifying for professional examination.

"4. That no kind of official notice was ever given to us that a doubt existed respecting our admission to the ordinary professional examinations, until certain of our number had com-

pleted their preparations for the first professional examination, and had paid their fees for and received tickets of admission to the same; and that, when the matter was brought before the Senatus, it was by them decided that ladies should be admitted to the examination, and accordingly the ladies in question were examined in the ordinary course, and passed the examination successfully.

"5. That, under the existing Act of Parliament, it is impossible for any person to practise medicine under legal sanction, without a distinct 'qualification' as defined by the said Act of Parliament.

"6. That the only 'qualification' which it is in the power of the University of Edinburgh to grant, is the ordinary medical degree; and that no 'certificates of proficiency' would possess the slightest legal value, unless a special Act of Parliament was passed making such certificates registrable qualifications.

"7. That the difficulty and expense of procuring such a special Act of Parliament would be very much greater than that of obtaining the sanction of the Queen in Council to such minor alterations in the University Ordinances as are alone necessary to enable us to complete our education by means of additional extra-mural classes; even if your honourable Court declines to make the necessary arrangements *within* the University.

"8. That we are informed on high authority that it is at present within the power of your honourable Court, in conjunction with the Senatus, to make the necessary arrangements within the University, without any external sanction; either by ordaining that the present Professors shall instruct women in separate classes, or by appointing special lecturers for that purpose. As regards the former course, I venture to remark that several Professors in the Faculty of Arts are already delivering two or more lectures daily, and that, as I presume it was always contemplated that each Professor should instruct all matriculated students desiring to study his subject, it is quite conceivable that it might become necessary, from the number of students, or otherwise, for the medical Professors also to be required to deliver two courses; and that, therefore, it could hardly be considered a hardship if they should be required to deliver a second course, with proper remuneration for the same, to those matriculated students who are forbidden by the University to attend in the ordinary classes. As regards the second alternative, I believe that it has never been doubted that the Senatus and University Court, conjointly, have the power of appointing any number of assistants or special lecturers in any faculty, if they are required for the efficient performance of the teaching of the University.

"9. That, as the main difficulty before your honourable Court seems to be that regarding graduation, with which we are not immediately concerned at this moment, we are quite willing to rest our claims to ultimate graduation on the facts as they stand up to the present date; and in case your honourable Court will now make arrangements whereby we can continue our education, we will undertake not to draw any arguments in favour of our right to graduation from such future arrangements, so that they may at least be made without prejudice to the present legal position of the University.

"10. That we are informed by high legal authorities that we are entitled, as matriculated students, to demand from the University complete arrangements for our instruction, and that we are further entitled to bring an action of declarator to obtain the same from the several Professors, if no alternative measures are devised; and that we shall inevitably be driven to pursue this course, with whatever reluctance, if your honourable Court persistently refuses to make, in any form whatever, such arrangements as may enable us to complete our education, and to obtain a legal qualification to practise.

"Earnestly commending the above considerations to your most favourable notice, I have the honour, etc.,

"SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE."

(4.) *From the Secretary of the University Court.*

This letter is given in the text, p. 137.

(5.) *To the University Court.*

"15 BUCCLEUCH PLACE, February 9, 1872.

"GENTLEMEN,—I beg to thank you sincerely for the resolution to which you came on Monday the 5th inst., and which, if I understand it rightly, will, I trust, prove a satisfactory solution of our present difficulties.

"We will, if you wish it, very gladly prepare and submit to your honourable Court a list extra-academical lecturers, and of gentlemen prepared to qualify as such, who may, with your sanction, instruct us in the various subjects which we have to study; but before doing so, I venture to beg for official confirmation of my interpretation of your late resolution in two essential particulars.

"I trust that I am correct in understanding—

"1. That though you at present give us no pledge respecting our ultimate graduation, it is your intention to consider the proposed extra-mural courses as 'qualifying' for graduation,

and that you will take such measures as may be necessary to secure that they will be accepted if it is subsequently determined that the University has the power of granting degrees to women.

"2. That we shall be admitted in due course to the ordinary professional examinations, on presentation of the proper certificates of attendance on the said extra-mural classes.

"You will, I am sure, understand that, while we are quite willing to accept present arrangements for instruction without any pledge that they will confer a right to graduation, it would be useless for us to attend any classes which would be incapable of qualifying for graduation, and impossible for us to acquiesce in any agreement which might prejudice the claim which we believe ourselves to possess to the ultimate attainment of the medical degree.—I am, etc.,

"SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE."

(6.) *From the Secretary of the University Court.*

"UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, 24th February 1872.

"MADAM,—Your letter dated 9th instant has been considered by the University Court. In it you say—

"'I trust that I am correct in understanding—

"'1. That though you at present give us no pledge respecting our ultimate graduation, it is your intention to consider the proposed extra-mural courses as "qualifying" for graduation, and that you will take such measures as may be necessary to secure that they will be so accepted, if it is subsequently determined that the University has the power of granting degrees to women.

"'2. That we shall be admitted in due course to the ordinary professional examinations, on presentation of the proper certificates of attendance on the said extra-mural classes.'

"In reply, I am desired to point out that no extra-mural courses, beyond the number of four allowed by the Ordinance of the Universities Commissioners, could either qualify for graduation or for the ordinary professional examinations, except under a change in the ordinance; which change could be made only by a resolution of the Court, sanctioned by the Chancellor, and approved by the Queen in Council.

"The Court have already declared, in their resolution of the 8th of January last, that they cannot even enter on the consideration of the expediency of such a change in the ordinance until the legality of female graduation has been determined.

"It would not only be premature for the Court to express at present any views or intentions on the points to which you refer, but it would be clearly contrary to their duty to do so. For, supposing the legal question to be decided in a way favourable to your wishes, those points would then doubtless be referred to the Court for their decision, when various parties would probably desire to be heard with regard to them.

"I am to add that, in your letter of the 18th January, you appeared merely to ask that the Court 'will now make arrangements whereby we can continue our education,' and that the Court offered, as stated in my letter of the 5th inst., to meet your views in the only way which appeared to lie within their competency. The Court are still of opinion that it is quite impossible for them at present to add anything to that offer.—I have the honour, etc.,

"J. CHRISTISON, Secretary."

NOTE EE, p. 147.

(1.) *From Dr. Garrett Anderson.*

. . . . "The real solution of the difficulty will, I believe, be found in Englishwomen seeking abroad that which is at present denied to them in their own country. By going to Paris, female students can get, without further difficulty or contention, at a very small cost, a first-class medical education, a choice of all the best hospital teachers of the place, a succession of stimulating and searching examinations, and a diploma of recognized value. The one serious drawback to the plan is, that the Paris degree, in spite of its acknowledged worth, does not entitle its holder to registration as a medical practitioner in this country. It is, however, possible to exaggerate the disadvantages of not being registered. Probably the most serious one is that the names of unregistered practitioners do not appear in the *Medical Directory*.

"On theoretical grounds, it has been said that a woman holding a degree not registrable would not find any one willing to meet her in consultation. As a matter of fact, however, this is incorrect, as the ladies now practising in England on such degrees never have had the slightest difficulty made by any one whose opinion they have wished to have; and if such an objection should ever be made on this score, it would be easy to avoid its repetition when future consultations were desired. London is not so poor in consultants that if one had

scruples of this sort another could not be found to replace him. Another drawback to practising on a good foreign degree, which is made the most of by timid folks, is that only registered practitioners can sue for the recovery of fees. This is true; but fortunately most people pay their debts without being sued, and probably the chief result of this disability would be that a lady practising on these terms would be a trifle more cautious about trusting strangers than she would otherwise be. It should be remembered, too, that a good many people who might go to law for the recovery of fees, prefer to lose some now and then rather than get them at the price of a law-suit. Another objection urged is, that women holding foreign diplomas would not be eligible for public appointments. With regard to hospital appointments—*e.g.* house-surgeon or resident physician—this is incorrect: two ladies have lately been appointed to such posts in Birmingham and Bristol, while as to other and more public appointments—*e.g.* poor-law medical officer or officer of health—it is extremely improbable that a woman would be chosen if legally eligible. . . . Even were the disadvantages and risks of practising upon a foreign degree more serious than they are, there is good reason to think that the quickest way of getting the law of registration altered would be to systematically disregard it.

"If a hundred women were practising medicine in England in a creditable manner, and were able to say that they were unregistered through no fault or wish of their own, the injustice of the case would be felt universally, and either good foreign degrees would be made registrable, or women would be allowed to study medicine and take out a degree in England.

"From other points of view, also, I cannot but think that women can in no way better serve the cause we desire to promote, than by going to Paris to study medicine, and returning here as soon as may be to practise it. 'Nothing succeeds like success;' and if we could point to a considerable number of medical women quietly making for themselves the reputation of being trustworthy and valuable members of the profession, the various forms which present opposition now takes would insensibly disappear, and arrangements would be made for providing female medical students with the advantages which it appears hopeless to look for at present in this country."—*Times*, Aug. 5, 1873.

(2.) *From Miss Jex-Blake.*

15 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh, Aug. 8th.

"Sir,—I have only just seen the letter from Dr. Garrett Anderson which you published on the 5th inst., and I venture to beg that you will allow me to point out my reasons for thinking she has selected the very worst of all the alternatives suggested, when she advises Englishwomen to go abroad for medical education.

"In the first place, I think that Dr. Anderson assumes greatly too much in supposing that all the Scotch Universities are permanently closed to women by the recent decision, especially when notice has already been given in Parliament that a Scotch member will, at the beginning of next session, bring in a Bill to enable those Universities both to teach and examine female students . . . Even if the Scotch universities are left out of the question, those of Cambridge and London may well be expected to move in a matter like the present; or it would hardly seem unreasonable to hope that some of the surplus revenues in Ireland might be applied in one way or another to the solution of the present difficulty. I think, moreover, that Mrs. Anderson concedes very much more than has yet been proved, when she states that the examining bodies, such as the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, 'have the power to refuse to admit women to their examinations and qualifications.' That they have the will to do so may, I fear, only be too probable, but it is at least a very open question whether such power does lie in their hands. I have been assured on very good authority that this is not the case; and at any rate I believe no decision to that effect has ever been given by a court of law. Certainly the *primâ facie* assumption would lie the other way. The Medical Act of 1858 in no way excludes women from the profession, and two women are actually registered under its provisions. It is, therefore, hardly credible that, when all candidates are by the Act required to submit to certain examinations, the examining boards should at their option be able to turn away all applicants who are not of the male sex, no mention of any such power being contained in the Act itself; nor, I think, need we assume even a desire to exclude women on the part of all the examining boards, until application has been made to each individually; and this has never, so far as I am aware, been done at present.

"I trust, therefore, that I have shown that Mrs. Anderson's advice that all Englishwomen desiring to study medicine should at once expatriate themselves, is premature in the extreme; I hope further to show that it is moreover radically erroneous in principle, even if it should ultimately be proved (as is at present by no means the case) that women cannot obtain official examination in this country, and therefore cannot enter their names on the Register, it would still, I think, be very far from certain that their best plan was to seek such examination abroad, seeing that after having spent years of labour and much money, they would, as regards legal recognition, be exactly as far as ever from gaining their end. Mrs. Anderson

says that they would at least obtain 'what is denied them in their own country, a first-class medical education.' If it were true that such an education could not be got without going abroad, there would no doubt be much force in this argument, but I submit that this is not the case. Without stopping to consider the alternatives brought forward by your correspondent herself—the establishment of a new school for women, or the purchase of one of the existing hospital schools—either of which seems to me infinitely preferable, Mrs. Anderson quite overlooks the fact that at this moment medical classes of first-rate quality can be obtained in Edinburgh in the extra-mural school (many of whose lecturers stand much higher than the University professors in public estimation), and that with very little trouble a complete curriculum of medical study could be there arranged, without altering any of the existing conditions of affairs. The doors of the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary have also been thrown open to women, though under some restrictions, and excellent clinical instruction is given to them there by two of the best and most popular teachers in the city. Can any one doubt that when so much has been secured, and when every year promises increased facilities, it is infinitely better that Englishwomen should study medicine under the direction of their own countrymen, in their own language, and amid the social and hygienic conditions which will occur in their own future practice, rather than in a foreign land, from lecturers who teach in a strange language, and in hospitals where all the arrangements and theories vary from those in this country, and where even the types of disease may be so far modified as greatly to lessen the value of the instruction for those who intend to practise medicine in Great Britain . . . No foreign diploma or degree is at present acknowledged as qualifying for registration in this country; and though it may be well for those who covet such ornamental honours to go through the examinations requisite to obtain them, I cannot see any ground on which it would be worth the while of most Englishwomen to live for years abroad to arrive at a result so eminently unpractical. We live under English law, and to English law we must conform, so far as lies in our power; if we are arbitrarily precluded from such compliance, it is to the English Government that we must look for a remedy. I can imagine few things that would please our opponents better than to see one Englishwoman after another driven out of her own country to obtain medical education abroad, both because they know that, on her return after years of labour, she can claim no legal recognition whatever, and because they are equally certain that, so long as no means of education are provided at home, only a very small number of women will ever seek admission to the profession. I do not say that a woman may not be justified in going abroad for education if her circumstances make it imperative that she should as soon as possible enter upon medical practice; but I do say, and I most firmly believe, that every woman who consents to be thus exiled does more harm than can easily be calculated to the general cause of medical women in this country, and postpones indefinitely, so far as in her lies, the final and satisfactory solution of the whole question.

"It is no easy thing to remember at all times that—

'They also serve who only stand and wait;'

but I do believe profoundly that at this moment the very best service we can do to the cause in which we are all interested, is to make use of every opportunity open to us in this country to qualify ourselves as thoroughly as possible for the profession we have chosen, and then (refusing resolutely to be driven into byways or unauthorized measures) to demand, quietly but firmly, that provision for our ultimate recognition as medical practitioners which we have a right to expect at the hands of the Legislature. Mrs. Anderson seems to think it hopeless that the present Parliament should 'promote the interests of an unrepresented class;' but it must be remembered that one of the very strongest arguments against granting the franchise to women has always been that their substantial interests are and will be provided for by the existing Government, and a case like the present will certainly afford a crucial test of the truth of these assertions. If they be true, we cannot doubt that Parliament will in its next Session make full provision for a case of such unexampled hardship; and if, on the other hand, this be not done, the argument above referred to can hardly be again brought forward when the suffrage for women shall again be claimed.

"Let me therefore conclude, as I began, by protesting as strongly as lies in my power against this idea of sending abroad every Englishwoman who wishes to study medicine; let me entreat all such women to join the class already formed in Edinburgh, the majority of whose members are thoroughly of one mind with me in this matter, and who, having counted the cost, are, like myself, thoroughly resolved to 'fight it out on this line,' and neither to be driven out of our own country for education, nor to be induced to cease to make every effort in our power to obtain from the Legislature that measure of justice which we imperatively need, and which is, in point of fact, substantially implied in the provisions of the Medical Act of 1858.—I am, Sir, yours obediently, SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE."

—*Times*, August 23, 1873.

NOTE FF, p. 153.

The classes taken in Edinburgh were as follows :—

University.

Physiology—Professor Hughes Bennett. | Chemistry—Professor Crum Brown.
Practical Physiology—Dr. M'Kendrick. | Practical Chemistry—Mr. Dewar.
Botany—Professor Balfour.

Extra-Mural School.

Natural History—Dr. Alleyne Nicholson. Anatomy and Practical Anatomy—Dr. Handyside. Surgery—Dr. Heron Watson.	*Mixed Classes.*
Chemistry—Dr. Macadam. Practice of Medicine—Dr. G. W. Balfour. Clinical Medicine—Dr. G. W. Balfour. Clinical Surgery—Dr. Watson. Midwifery—Dr. Keiller. Materia Medica—Dr. Moinet. Medical Jurisprudence—Dr. Littlejohn. Pathology—Dr. Coghill.	*Separate Classes.*

NOTE GG, pp. 114, 173.

Petition in favour of Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill, from Lecturers in the School of Medicine, Edinburgh, to the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The Humble Petition of the undersigned Doctors of Medicine and Lecturers in the School of Medicine in Edinburgh.

SHEWETH—

That your Petitioners see no reason of justice or expediency why women should be excluded from the profession and practice of Medicine, but, on the contrary, believe that the services of thoroughly qualified women in that profession might be advantageous to the community in various ways, and especially to their own sex.

That your Petitioners have therefore observed with much regret, that the recent endeavours of a number of women to qualify themselves for the medical profession, by the appointed course of study and of examinations, in connection with the University of Edinburgh, have encountered difficulties and discouragements from the beginning, and that it seems finally to have been ascertained, in their case, that, in the present state of the law in Great Britain and Ireland, no woman can, anywhere in the whole realm, obtain a legal passport into the profession of Medicine.

That your Petitioners are confirmed in this feeling by the special experience they have had as instructors of the said women in various branches of medical knowledge : Your Petitioners have certainly found no deficiency either of zeal or of aptitude for medical studies on their part ; and have every reason to believe that in the actual practice of the profession, after complete training, they would do credit to the school or schools that had trained them : Yet, while the lectures in the Edinburgh School of Medicine, to which your Petitioners have the honour to belong, qualify young men for admission into the medical profession, and are valid also in a certain proportion for medical degrees in the University of Edinburgh and the other Scotch Universities, precisely the same course of instruction, if taken by women, must, until the law is altered, count for nothing in their case.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will pass the Bill entitled "A Bill to remove doubts as to the Powers of the Universities of Scotland to admit Women as Students, and to grant Degrees to Women;"

And your Petitioners will ever pray, etc.

PATRICK HERON WATSON, M.D., F.R.C.S. Edin., F.R.S. Edin.,
Lecturer on Surgery and Clinical Surgery, Senior Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary, Examiner in Surgery to the University of St. Andrews and Royal College of Physicians, Examiner Royal College of Surgeons.

George W. Balfour, M.D., F.R.C.P. Edin.,
Lecturer on Medicine and Clinical Medicine, Physician to the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Examiner in Medicine to the University of St. Andrews and to the Edinburgh Royal College of Physicians.
Alexander Keiller, M.D., F.R.C.P. Edin., F.R.S.E.,
Lecturer on Midwifery and the Diseases of Women and Children, Physician to the Royal Maternity Hospital, Examiner in Midwifery to the University of St. Andrews, and to the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh.
J. Sinclair Coghill, M.D., F.R.C.P.E.,
Lecturer on General Pathology, Edinburgh School of Medicine.
Francis W. Moinet, M.D., F.R.C.P. Edin.,
Lecturer on Materia Medica and Therapeutics, Edinburgh School of Medicine.
Henry D. Littlejohn, M.D. Edin., F.R.C.S.E.,
Lecturer on Medical Jurisprudence, Examiner to the Royal College of Surgeons and to the University of St. Andrews, Medical Officer of Health for Edinburgh.
John G. M'Kendrick, M.D., F.R.C.P.E., F.R.S.E.,
Lecturer on Physiology or Institutes of Medicine, Examiner on Physiology for the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh.
P. D. Handyside, M.D., F.R.C.S.E., F.R.S.E.,
Teacher of Anatomy in the Edinburgh School of Medicine, Examiner to the Royal College of Surgeons, etc., lately Senior Acting Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, and President of the Medico-Chirurgical Society.
Stevenson Macadam, Ph. D., F.R.S.E., F.C.S.,
Lecturer on Chemistry in the School of Medicine, Edinburgh, and Ex-President of the Royal Scottish Society of Arts.

NOTE HH, pp. 178, 181, 209.

LONDON SCHOOL OF MEDICINE FOR WOMEN,

30 Henrietta Street, Brunswick Square, W.C.

Below are given the officials of the School (1) in 1874, and (2) in 1886:—

(1) *In September* 1874.

Provisional Council.

Dr. Garrett Anderson; Dr. Charlton Bastian, F.R.S.; Dr. Billing, F.R.S.; Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell; Dr. Broadbent; Dr. King Chambers; Dr. Cheadle; Mr. George Cowell; Mr. Critchett; Mr. Ernest Hart; Mr. Berkeley Hill; Professor Huxley, F.R.S.; Dr. Hughlings Jackson; Dr. Murie; Mr. A. T. Norton; Dr. Payne; Dr. W. S. Playfair; Mr. Rivington; Dr. Burdon Sanderson, F.R.S.; Dr. P. H. Stokoe; Dr. Sturges.

Lecturers.

Anatomy—Mr. A. T. Norton, *St. Mary's Hospital.*
Physiology and Practical Physiology—Mr. Schafer, *University College*, and Dr. Dupuy.
Chemistry—Mr. Heaton, F.C.S., *Charing Cross Hospital.*
Botany—Dr. P. H. Stokoe, *Guy's Hospital.*
Materia Medica—Dr. Sturges, *Westminster Hospital.*
Practice of Medicine—Dr. King Chambers, *St. Mary's Hospital.*
Midwifery—Dr. Garrett Anderson.
Forensic Medicine—Dr. Dupre, F.C.S., *Charing Cross Hospital.*
Surgery—Mr. Berkeley Hill, *University College.*
Ophthalmic Surgery—Mr. Critchett.
Pathology—Dr. Charlton Bastian, F.R.S., *University College*, and Dr. Cheadle, *St. Mary's Hospital.*
Comparative Anatomy—Dr. Murie, *Middlesex Hospital.*
Dean of the School—Mr. A. T. Norton.

Trustees—Dr. King Chambers, Miss Jex-Blake, Mr. A. T. Norton, Mrs. Thorne.
Bankers—Messrs. Barnetts, Hoares & Co., 60 Lombard Street, E.C.

(2) *In April* 1886.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

Rt. Hon. Lord Aberdare; Earl of Aberdeen; Dowager Countess of Buchan; Rt. Hon. Earl of Dufferin, K.P.; Rt. Rev. Bishop of Exeter; Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley; Countess Granville.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

Dr. Garrett Anderson; Dr. Atkins, L.K.Q.C.P.I.; Mrs. H. Fleming Baxter; Mr. Stanley Boyd, M.B., B.S.; Mr. Bond, F.R.C.S.; Mrs. W. Burbury; Dr. T. K. Chambers, F.R.C.P.; Dr. Cockle, A.M.; Rev. Llewellyn Davies; Dr. Horatio Donkin, M.A.; Dr. S. Jex-Blake, M.K.Q.C.P.I.; Dr. Mary Marshall. L.K.Q.C.P.I.; Mr. A. T. Norton, F.R.C.S; Professor Schafer, F.R.S., M.R.C.S; Miss Edith Shove, M.B. Lond.; Rt. Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P.; Mrs. Thorne; Dr. Augustus Waller; Mr. Robert Wilson.

BANKERS—Lloyds, Barnetts & Bosanquets, Ld., 60 Lombard Street, E.C.
HON. TREASURER—The Right Hon. James Stansfeld, M.P.
TRUSTEES—Dr. King Chambers, Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake, Mr. A. T. Norton, and Mrs. Thorne.
AUDITOR—Lieut.-Col. Britten.
HON. SECRETARY—Mrs. Thorne.

LECTURERS AND OFFICERS AT THE SCHOOL.

Anatomy and Practical Anatomy—Stanley Boyd, M.B. and B.S. Lond., F.R.C.S.; Assistant-Surgeon, Charing Cross Hospital.
Physiology and Practical Physiology—John M'William, M.D. Aberdeen.
Chemistry and Practical Chemistry—C. W. Heaton, F.C.S.; Lecturer on Chemistry, Charing Cross Hospital; Examiner in Chemistry, Royal College of Physicians.
**Botany*—P. H. Stokoe, B.A., M.B. Lond., F.L.S.
Materia Medica—Harrington Sainsbury, M.D. Lond.; Assistant-Physician, Royal Free Hospital.
Practice of Medicine—Dr. Garrett Anderson, Senior Physician, New Hospital for Women. Horatio Donkin, M.A., M.B. Oxon., F.R.C.P.; Physician, Westminster Hospital; Physician, East London Hospital for Children.
Midwifery—Ford Anderson. M.D. Aberdeen, L.R.C.S. Edin.
Diseases of Women—Dr. Louisa Atkins, L.K.Q.C.P.I., Physician, New Hospital for Women.
Forensic Medicine—Dr. Dupre, F.R.S., F.C.S.; Lecturer on Medical Jurisprudence, Westminster Hospital. Thomas Bond, M.B. and B.S. Lond., F.R.C.S.; Lecturer on Medical Jurisprudence, Westminster Hospital.
Practice of Surgery—A. T. Norton, F.R.C.S; Surgeon, St. Mary's Hospital; Lecturer on Surgery, St. Mary's Medical School.
Pathology—
Comparative Anatomy, or Zoology and Biology—James Murie, M.D. Glasg., LL.D., F.L.S.
**Hygiene*—Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake, M.K.Q.C.P.I.
**Mental Pathology*—W. H. O. Sankey, M.D. Lond.
Ophthalmic Surgery—Grosvenor Mackinlay, Ophthalmic Surgeon, Royal Free Hospital.
Demonstrator of Anatomy—Miss Frances Harris.
Assistant Demonstrator of Anatomy—Miss Jessie Hunter.
Honorary Librarian—Mrs. Dowson, L.K.Q.C.P.I.
Honorary Curator of Museums—Mr. Stanley Boyd, M.B., B.S.
Medical Tutor—Mrs. Dowson, L.K.Q.C.P.I.
Dean of the School—Dr. Garrett Anderson.

* These courses of Lectures are not given every year.

ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL,
Gray's Inn Road.

Students at the London School of Medicine for Women are admitted for their practical instruction to the Royal Free Hospital.

MEDICAL OFFICERS AT THE ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL.

Consulting Surgeons—Thomas H. Wakley, Esq., Alexander G. Marsden, Esq.
Physicians—John Cockle, M.D. Aberdeen, F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S. Samuel West, M.D. and M.A. Oxon., F.R.C.P.; Medical Tutor, St. Bartholomew's Hospital; Examiner in Anatomy and Physiology, University, Oxon.

Surgeons—Frederick Gant, F.R.C.S. William Rose, M.B. and B.S. Lond., F.R.C.S.; Surgeon, King's College Hospital.
Physician for the Diseases of Women—T. C. Hayes, M.D. Dublin, B.A.; Physician Accoucheur and Physician for Diseases of Women and Children, King's College Hospital.
Ophthalmic Surgeon—Grosvenor Mackinlay, L.R.C.P., F.R.C.S.E.; Surgeon, Royal South London Ophthalmic Hospital.
Assistant-Surgeon—Albert Boyce Barrow, F.R.C.S., M.B.; Lecturer on Minor Surgery; Assistant-Surgeon, Westminster Hospital.
Assistant Physician—Harrington Sainsbury, M.D. Lond., M.R.C.P.
Pathological Demonstrator—Harrington Sainsbury, M.D. Lond.
Dentist—Hasler Harris, Esq.
Resident Medical Officer—J. J. Powell, M.B. Lond.

The Hospital contains 160 beds, 74 of which are reserved for surgical, 64 for medical, 12 for gynæcological and 6 for ophthalmic cases.

Clinical Lectures are given once a fortnight by each of the four senior members of the Hospital Staff. Instruction is also given at the Hospital as follows:—

Tutorial Course of Clinical Instruction and Pathological Demonstrations — Harrington Sainsbury, M.D.
Minor Surgery, 10 Demonstrations on the Art of Bandaging, beginning in October—Albert Boyce Barrow.
Practical Pharmacy—Mr. S. Barber, F.R.C.S.

London School of Medicine for Women,

30 Henrietta Street, Brunswick Square, W.C.

Statement of Accounts

From August 1st 1874 to March 31st 1877.

Receipts.

	1874-75.	1875-76.	1876-77.	Total.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Donations,	1410 0 0	112 15 0	380 7 0 =	1903 2 0
Students' Fees,	473 4 0	492 19 0	283 7 0 =	1249 10 0
Scholarships (Mr. Hart),		50 0 0	50 0 0 =	100 0 0
Bank Interest,	1 12 5	5 2 9	=	6 15 2
Advanced by Dr. S. Jex-Blake,			30 0 0 =	30 0 0
	£1884 16 5	£660 16 9	£743 14 0	£3289 7 2

Payments.

	1874-75.	1875-76.	1876-77.	Total.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Lease of house and fixtures,	496 6 9			496 6 9
Lecturers' Fees,	420 0 0	690 10 0	383 12 0 =	1494 2 0
Salaries and Wages,	78 0 0	161 5 6	167 5 6 =	406 11 0
Rents and Taxes,	65 15 11	91 16 7	101 6 10 =	258 18 4
Furniture and Repairs,	53 12 5	22 9 1	1 3 0 =	77 4 6
School Apparatus and Prizes,	40 6 7	37 17 4½	17 15 0 =	95 18 11½
Library and Museum,	14 1 5½	13 5 2	1 0 6 =	18 7 1½
Printing and Advertisements,	16 2 1	76 14 1	7 0 6 =	99 16 8
Postage and Stationery,	14 9 7½	23 9 2¼	11 13 0 =	49 11 10
Fuel and Gas,	12 0 11	23 1 3	19 17 3 =	54 9 5
Expenses of Anatomy,		15 10 2½	34 2 0½ =	49 12 3
Law Expenses and Insurance,		19 7 7	0 19 0 =	20 6 7
Scholarships,		50 0 0	50 0 0 =	100 0 0
Sundries,	10 4 8½	15 11 11	10 6 3 =	36 2 10½
	£1221 0 5½	1240 16 11½	805 10 10½	3267 8 3½
Balance in Bank and Dean's hands,				21 18 10½
				£3289 7 2

Compared and found correct, 2*nd May*, 1878. (Signed) J. THORNE, JANE MARTINEAU, } *Auditors.*

NOTE II, p. 190.

(1.) *Letter to President of General Medical Council, written by direction of the Lord President of the Privy Council.*

"Medical Department, Privy Council Office,
"8th June 1875.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Lord President to request that, at the meeting now shortly to be held of the General Medical Council, you will have the goodness to bring under the consideration of that body the Bill which has been introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. Cowper-Temple 'to amend the Medical Act, 1858, so far as relates to the Registration of Women who have taken the Degree of Doctor of Medicine in a foreign university,' and that you will move the Medical Council to favour his Grace with their observations upon it.

"It appears to the Lord President that Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill, though very limited in its direct scope, can hardly fail to raise in Parliament the general question whether women ought to be able to look to medical practice, or certain branches of it, as open to them equally with men as a profession and means of livelihood. And I am to say that, as Government may have to express an opinion on this general question, with regard, on the one hand, to women who desire to obtain legal status as medical practitioners in this country, and, on the other hand, to the examination rules, or other conditions, which prevent them from accomplishing their wish, his Grace would be glad that the observations with which the Medical Council may favour him should not be restricted to the particular proposal of Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill, but should discuss, as fully as the Medical Council may see fit, the object to which that proposal would contribute.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"John Simon.

"Dr. Acland, F.R.S., Oxford."

(2.) *Report of General Medical Council in reply to above.*

"(a) In reply to the communication addressed to them by direction of the Lord President of the Privy Council, the Medical Council have to state that they have felt bound to consider the whole question of the admission of women to the medical profession.

"(b) The Medical Council are of opinion that the study and practice of medicine and surgery, instead of affording a field of exertion well fitted for women, do, on the contrary, present special difficulties which cannot be safely disregarded; but the Council are not prepared to say that women ought to be excluded from the profession.

"(c) With regard to Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill 'to amend the Medical Act, 1858, so far as relates to the Registration of Women who have taken the Degree of Doctor of Medicine in a foreign university,' considered by itself, and apart from its bearings on the 'general question whether women ought to be able to look to medical practice, or certain branches of it, as open to them equally with men, as a profession and means of livelihood,' the Council have found no difficulty in forming an opinion. By the Medical Act, 1858, the Council are precluded from registering foreign degrees, and, consequently, have been compelled repeatedly to refuse to register foreign degrees held by men.

"(d) The reason for this is obvious, viz. that the Council have no means of exercising that supervision and control over the education and examination required for foreign degrees, to which the licensing bodies of this country, whether universities or corporations, are, by the Act of 1858, subjected. But this privilege, which the Medical Act refuses (and the Council believe, very properly refuses) to men, Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill proposes to grant to women. Against such a proposal the Council feel bound to offer a protest, as being subversive of the main principle of the Medical Act.

"(e) If it should appear to the Government and the Legislature expedient that women, who desire to obtain a legal status as medical practitioners in this country, should not be debarred from obtaining that status, the Council are of opinion that it should be under some such arrangements as the following:—

"1. That in the interests of public order, the education and examinations of female students of medicine should be conducted entirely apart from those of male students.

"2. That with reference to the 'examination rules or other conditions' which prevent women from accomplishing their wish, the Medical Council have to state that under the provisions of the Medical Act, those persons only can be placed upon the 'Medical Register' who have been admitted to medical degrees in the universities, or who have been admitted fellows, members, or licentiates of one of the medical corporations of the United Kingdom. Should the universities and corporations be unable or unwilling to admit women to their degrees, or to admit them as licentiates or members of the respective corporations, the

Council are of opinion that sufficient provision would be made to enable women to obtain a 'legal status as medical practitioners in this country,' if an Act of Parliament were passed which should enable the Medical Council to recognize such examination or examinations as the Medical Council may from time to time deem sufficient for the purpose of granting admission of women to the 'Medical Register' under the title of 'Licensed Practitioners of Medicine.' The education and examinations for these licences should be under the supervision of the Medical Council in the same way as is required for the other licences of this country. The Council are of opinion that any course of legislation which would interfere with the free action of the universities and corporations mentioned in Schedule A, in respect of the medical education, examination, and licensing of women, is undesirable.

"3. That the examinations of female candidates for a licence entitling their names to be placed on the 'Register,' should be equivalent to those of male candidates.

"(F) The Council have already had their attention drawn to the importance of securing more efficient instruction for women who engage in the practice of midwifery, and whose services are largely employed, especially by the poor of this country. The Council feel very strongly that it is desirable that some means should be adopted for securing a better education, and granting certificates of competency, to women who act as midwives. For, whilst fully admitting that for the safe and efficient practice of midwifery as a branch of medical science, a full and complete education both in medicine and surgery is necessary, the Council believe that a much more limited and less expensive education might be afforded to women, who, after due examination, might, as midwives, render valuable service to the community, and supply a deficiency long felt and expressed. For women thus educated and certificated, it might be desirable that a special Register should be provided."

NOTE JJ, p. 194.

"4 Upper Berkeley Street, W.

" . . . The examination rules formulated by any one examining body, ought to be identical for men and women. Otherwise, what security have women that it shall not be enacted that, *e.g.*, one year's study shall be enough for women, while three or four are required for men, or that nothing but minor surgery shall be expected from women? What point can there be in having 'such distinctions as may be judged necessary between men and women' in the rules for the examination, if the standard for the two sexes is really to be identical? The only possible justification for difference in the rules is difference in the ultimate result. If women are to be required to know less or more than men, then the rules guiding admission to the examination may differ for the two sexes, but not otherwise. What women ask is that they should be required to know as much as men do, and that they should be required to submit to the same course of educational discipline, and not encouraged to cram into one or two years that which in the case of men occupies three or four years.

It is evident, however, in sub-section (*a*) of the amended clause, that the Council does not anticipate that any of the existing boards will avail themselves of the permission to examine women, and that it looks forward to this being undertaken by a special board created by the Council expressly for that purpose. In this case, so far from advancing towards a uniform standard of medical attainment, the object desired by every one not warped by corporate interests, there would be added to the nineteen existing bodies a twentieth, differing as much from all the others as they differ from each other. What security would the public, the medical women, or the general body of the medical profession, have that this new board, for women only, a board whose examination rules would differ from those of other bodies to suit the supposed requirements of the candidates—what security would any one have that this board would give a diploma or licence of equivalent value to that given by any one of the existing boards?

The truth is, that the Medical Council knows that there could be no such security, and that the fact would be patent to the outside public as well as to the profession, and they admit this by the final suggestion to put women coming in upon this footing into a separate register. . . . The separate examination rules—the rules, *i.e.*, which will control the whole course of the students' education—the entirely separate course of instruction, the separate examination—all these lead up to the logical conclusion of a separate register for men and women. The register is simply the official list of persons who are legally qualified to practise medicine; and unless upon the theory that women are not to be educated and examined on the same scale with men, there can be no more sense in putting them into a separate register than there would be in putting fair-haired people into one register and dark-haired ones into another. The two registers cannot imply anything but difference of professional *status*. If they imply the same amount of training and knowledge, why have two lists where one would be in every way more equitable and more convenient? Moreover, there are now eight women on the common register. What will become of them if all other women

are put in a list apart? . . . What is wanted is, first, the formation of a compulsory conjoint board for each of the three divisions of the kingdom, which shall determine the *minimum* of knowledge in medicine, surgery, and midwifery required from all practitioners of medicine; and, second, that to the examinations of this board women shall be admitted on the same terms as men, that they shall share the same diploma, and be placed upon the same register. With the London University degrees open to women, in addition to the qualifying diploma of such a board, they would no longer have any fair ground of complaint.—I am, Sir, yours obediently, ELIZABETH GARRETT ANDERSON, M.D."

—*Times*, May 8, 1876.

NOTE KK, p. 197.

"It is now about three months since it was announced that the Royal College of Surgeons of England had been advised by their own Standing Counsel that it was not in their power to refuse admission to the licence in midwifery to any 'person' who complied with their ordinary conditions, and who could pass the usual examinations, and that, consequently, this licence should henceforth be open to women on the same terms as to men. This opportunity of obtaining admission to the Register was at once embraced by three ladies, who seven years ago began their studies at the University of Edinburgh, and who have since then passed through the full curriculum of study required for its degree, to examination for which, however, they have been refused admission, under circumstances which will not soon be forgotten.

"These ladies now sent in their certificates of attendance on all the classes required, and a month's delay took place for the thorough examination of these certificates, which were ultimately declared to be satisfactory, and accepted by the college. It is worth remark that no candidate can be admitted to the licence in midwifery who has not gone through the full curriculum required for the membership of the College of Surgeons, and it appears that in this instance the certificates sent up were considerably in excess of the usual number, as these ladies had fully followed out the more extensive requirements for a university degree. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Council of the College of Surgeons decided in favour of their claim to examination, and notified the fact to them in due course. But now comes the most amazing part of the story, or rather the part that would be amazing to any one not versed in medical tactics, and in the wonderful wire-pulling which has already distinguished an apparently preponderating portion of the profession throughout. As soon as it was announced that the ladies' certificates were perfectly satisfactory, and that they would consequently be admitted to the next examination, forthwith, and with truly edifying unanimity, the whole Board of Examiners resigned *en masse*. In another column is given their own explanation of this wonderful step, and the writer of it certainly deserves a compliment for the adroitness with which 'half the truth' is made to serve the purpose so unpleasantly identified with it by the poet's *Northern Farmer*. To read the well-turned sentences about the writer's 'sense of right' and 'deep feeling of injustice' (and 'injustice to women!'), the innocent reader might suppose that here were the words of a champion of chivalry instead of those of an arrant trades-unionist. In the first place, the 'duty imposed' is assumed to be quite novel, and altogether different from that which was from the first attached to the office of Examiner in Midwifery. Will it be believed that no change whatever has been made in any of the College regulations for the licence, that the requirements laid down and the advantages offered do not differ by one jot or tittle from what they have been for the twenty-four years that have elapsed since the examination was first established? The only novelty—and it is one to which the writer has not thought expedient to refer in plain terms—is that both sexes are now declared eligible for examination, whereas hitherto this privilege has been carefully reserved for one only.

"The next point that troubles the examiner's conscience is the 'fragmentary medical skill' of the 'persons' who are now to be examined. It is a little difficult to see how this scrupulous gentleman arrives at the conclusion that those who have taken the full curriculum prescribed by a university are sure to be so much more ignorant than the candidates he has previously examined, who may have complied but barely with the more limited requirements of the College of Surgeons. One would at least have thought that the best way of setting his mind at rest would have been to examine the 'persons' in question, and find out the extent of their 'fragments' of knowledge; but then this course might hardly have suited his ulterior, though less ostensible, objects, and besides, it might actually have aided these most obnoxious 'persons' to place their names on the Medical Register on the same terms as other people. Nothing has been more remarkable throughout the whole controversy than the extreme reluctance shown by the exclusionists' party to bring their own assertions to the test of facts, and to demonstrate the 'inherent inferiority of the female mind' by admitting all

comers alike to the same examinations, and trusting to the results to justify their foregone conclusions. Perhaps it is safer to declaim in the closet than to prove in the forum. It is at any rate certain that it has all along been the 'inferior minds' that have asked for fair play and no favour, and begged to be judged by the common standard; while it has been the *rôle* of the superior beings to vociferate unproved assertions, and to refuse the simple test of experience and fact."—*Scotsman*, April 15, 1876.

NOTE LL, p. 198.

It is not possible for me to turn aside to discuss the question of legislation for midwives, but Mr. Stansfeld most truly points out that it is likely to be treated in a spirit closely allied to that of which we have had experience. The following letter points out what I believe to be the chief dangers in the matter :—

"To the Editor of the 'Englishwoman's Review.'

"Madam,—I think you are quite right in suggesting that the proposed legislation for midwives should be carefully watched, and there are a few points in the Bill now issued to which I should like to direct special attention.

"1. The midwives are to have no voice whatever either on the Midwifery Board or on the Board of Examiners to be locally appointed; but are to be legislated for, governed, and examined exclusively by medical practitioners. If we refer to the somewhat similar Acts passed for the governance and examination of medical practitioners and dentists, respectively, we find that in each case those who successfully pass examinations may themselves become examiners; and, indeed, the Boards of Examiners *must* consist entirely in the one case, and partially in the other, of persons 'registered under the Act.' This Bill is an entirely new departure, as it places all authority over one class in the hands of another (and in some respects a rival) class of practitioners. What makes the matter the more flagrant, is that there is no provision that the Examiners in Midwifery must themselves have passed any examination in the subject; and it is notorious that one large class of general practitioners (the members of the Royal College of Surgeons who obtained their diplomas before 1882) have passed no examination whatever in midwifery. Yet they may, and probably will, be members of the Examining Boards, while no midwife, however highly qualified, can possibly have a seat there.

"2. When the Medical Acts of 1815 and 1858, and the Dentists' Act of 1878, were passed, it was expressly provided that, with certain limitations, persons already in practice should be entitled to registration. The new Bill, however, proposes that midwives already in practice shall only be registered on condition of producing (1) a certificate of competence signed by a qualified medical practitioner, and (2) a certificate of moral character signed by a clergyman, a justice of the peace, or a medical practitioner.

"3. A midwife's name is to be struck off the register if she is twice convicted of drunkenness; while, so far as I know, no such penalty is inflicted in a similar case on a dentist or medical practitioner.

"4. It is made penal for a non-registered woman to 'attempt to procure for herself any situation or employment as a midwife,' while no such penalty awaits unregistered persons who practise medicine or dentistry, if only they do not assume titles implying that they are 'registered under this Act.'

"5. Midwives are curtly forbidden by the Bill to 'perform any operation,' though it is notorious that many of the more highly-skilled midwives are really far more competent to operate than the average general practitioner, who may, or may not, have passed an examination on the subject. In country districts, moreover, lives will be sacrificed if this rule is rigidly adhered to.

"In short, the Bill bears evidence on its face that it has been drafted with reference to the views rather of medical practitioners than of midwives, and it is difficult to believe that some of its provisions have been devised with a single view to the benefit either of the public or of the midwives themselves. I think it specially behoves statesmen to see that the interests of those immediately concerned and of the public at large are fully and, indeed, exclusively considered; that no injustice may be done to a large class of persons who include within their ranks a small number of highly educated ladies, and a very large number of laborious workers, whose daily bread is at stake, and who are not very likely to secure direct representation in Parliament.—I am, Madam, yours obediently,

Sophia Jex-Blake, M.D.

"Manor Place, Edinburgh, April 7, 1883."

NOTE MM, p. 202.

Medical Act (Qualifications) Act.

[39 & 40 Victoria, Ch. 41.]

AN ACT to remove restrictions on the granting of Qualifications for Registration under the Medical Act on the ground of Sex. [11th AUGUST 1876.]

BE it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in the present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same:

1. The powers of every body entitled under the Medical Act to grant qualifications for registration shall extend to the granting of any qualification for registration granted by such body to all persons without distinction of sex: Provided always that nothing herein contained shall render compulsory the exercise of such powers, and that no person who but for this Act would not have been entitled to be registered shall, by reason of such registration, be entitled to take any part in the government, management, or proceedings of the universities or corporations mentioned in the said Medical Act.

2. This Act shall be taken to be incorporated with the Medical Act, as amended by the Act of the twenty-second year of Her Majesty, chapter twenty-one, and the Medical Act as so amended, and any other Act amending the Medical Act shall be construed and have effect accordingly.

NOTE NN, pp. 204, 211, 224.

REGISTERED MEDICAL WOMEN.

The following is a complete list of the women (fifty in number) who have, up to January 1st, 1886, taken medical diplomas entitling them to enter their names on the British Register of duly qualified medical practitioners. The names are arranged in the order, and with the year, of registration.

All except those marked * hold one or more diplomas from the Irish College of Physicians, with or without a University degree in addition.

1858. *Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell (M.D. Geneva, New York), Rock House, Hastings.
1866. *Dr. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson (M.D. Paris; L.S.A.), 4 Upper Berkeley Street, London, W.
1877. Dr. Eliza Walker Dunbar (M.D. Zurich), 4 Buckingham Villas, Clifton, Bristol.
Dr. Frances Hoggan (M.D. Zurich), 7 Trevor Terrace, London, S.W.
Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake (M.D. Bern), Bruntsfield Lodge, Edinburgh.
Dr. Louisa Atkins (M.D. Zurich), 37 Gloucester Place, London, W.
Dr. Edith Pechey (M.D. Bern), *Sen. Med. Off.*, Cama Hospital, Bombay, India.
1878. Dr. Annie Reay Barker (M.D. Paris), The Mount, Aldershot.
Dr. Ann Clark (M.D. Bern), 39 Hagley Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.
Dr. Agnes M'Laren (M.D. Montpellier), 26 York Place, Edinburgh.
Dr. Anna Dahms (M.D. Paris), 17 St. Ann's Square, and G.P.O., Manchester.
1879. Miss Jane E. Waterston, *Medical Missionary*, Cape Town, Africa.
Dr. Alice Ker (M.D. Bern), 6 Eldon Place, Leeds.
Dr. Eliza F. M'Donogh Frikart (M.D. Zurich), Zofingen, Aargau, Switzerland.
1880. Dr. Mary Marshall (M.D. Paris), 16 Stanley Gardens, London, W.
Dr. Matilda Chaplin Ayrton (M.D. Paris). *Died July 19th*, 1883.
Mrs. Foggo, c/o Messrs. Grindlay, 55 Parliament Street, London, S.W.
Mrs. Grant, 1 Haverland Villas, Acton.
Miss Alice Vickery, 333 Albany Road, London, S.E.
Miss Fanny Butler, *Medical Missionary*, Bhagulpur, India.
Mrs. Rushbrook, 25 Upper Phillimore Place, London, W.
1881. Miss Edith Shove (M.B. Lond., 1882), *Med. Officer* (Female Staff), G.P.O. London.
Mrs. Mears, 47 Front Street, Tynemouth.
Miss Alice Marston, *Medical Missionary*, Lucknow, India.
Dr. Hope Adams Walther (M.D. Bern), Neue Mainzer Strasse, Frankfort-on-Main.
Mrs. De la Cherois, 28 Clifton Gardens, Maida Vale, London W.

1882. Mrs. Julia Mitchell, 68 Sloane Street, London, S.W.
Miss Katherine Mitchell, 68 Sloane Street, London, S.W.
Miss Julia Cock, *Res. Med. Off.*, Convalescent Home, Braintree, Essex.
*Mrs. Mary Scharlieb (M.B. and B.S. Lond.), *Sen. Med. Off.*, Victoria Hospital, Madras, India.
1883. Miss Adela Bosanquet (Cert. Sanit. Sci.). Now studying abroad.
Mrs. Lougheed (Cert. Sanit. Sci.). Now studying abroad.
Mrs. Bird, 235 Kingsland Road, London, E.
Miss Lucy Cradock, 29 Catherine Street, and G.P.O., Liverpool.
Miss Arabella Kenealy, 21 Henrietta Street, London, W.
Miss Constance Hitchcock, 37 Gloucester Place, London, W.
*Miss Emily Tomlinson (M.B. Lond.), 30 Devonshire Street, London, W.
Miss Helen Prideaux (M.B. and B.S. Lond.). *Died Nov. 29th*, 1885.
1884. Miss Margaret Morice, 15 Queen's Crescent, London, N.W.
Miss Mary M'George, *Medical Missionary*, Ahmedebad, Gujerat, India.
Mrs. Russell Watson, *Medical Missionary*, China.
Mrs. Mary E. Dowson, 20 Westgate Terrace, London, S.W.
Dr. Ann M'Call (M.D. Bern), *Res. Med. Off.*, Maternity, Nine Elms Mission, S.W.
*Miss Lætitia Bernard (M.B. Lond.), *Medical Missionary*, India.
Miss Jane Walker, *Res. Med. Off.*, New Hospital for Women, N.W.
1885. Dr. Elizabeth Beilby (M.D. Bern), *Med. Off.*, Maternity Hospital, Lahore, India.
Miss Clarinda Boddy. Now abroad.
Miss Cathleen Graham, Benella, Painswick Road, Cheltenham.
Miss Catharine T. Urquhart, 31 Lauder Road, Edinburgh.
*Miss Mary E. Pailthorpe (M.B. Lond.), *Jun. Med. Off.*, Victoria Hospital, Madras.

Medical institutions for women and children, officered wholly or partially by registered medical women, in January 1886, are given below :—

London.—New Hospital for Women, 222 Marylebone Road, N.W.
Visiting-Physicians—Dr. Garrett Anderson; Dr. Louisa Atkins ; Dr. Mary Marshall; Mrs. De la Cherois, L.K.Q.C.P.I.
Notting-Hill.—The Portobello Road Provident Dispensary for Women and Children, 117 Portobello Road, W. *Medical Officer*—Dr. Mary Marshall.
Edinburgh.—(1.) The Edinburgh Hospital for Women and Children, 6 Grove Street, Fountainbridge. *Medical Officer*—Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake.
(2.) The Canongate Christian Institute Dispensary—Dr. Agnes M'Laren.
Bristol.—The Dispensary for Women and Children. *Medical Officer*—Dr. Walker Dunbar.
Leeds.—The Mill Street Dispensary. *Medical Officer*—Dr. Alice Ker.
Birmingham.—The Midland Hospital for Women, The Crescent. *Honorary Acting Physician*—Dr. Annie E. Clark.
Manchester.—The Dispensary for Women and Children, 74 Canal Street, Ancoats. *Medical Officer*—Dr. Anna Dahms.

NOTE OO, p. 206.

The following *resumé* of the history, by the Right Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P., will, I think, be read with interest, though it fails to state the case quite fairly, because his own very large share in our ultimate success is wholly omitted, and because in his generous kindness he gives more credit than is due in other quarters.

"I desire now to go back upon this sketch of events for the sake of a few words upon the various parts which persons and institutions have played.

"And first for the University of Edinburgh and its part. Women have been in this movement immensely indebted to that university in more ways than one. They are indebted to those members of the university (a majority of the non-medical professors) who have stood by them from the first, who helped them to, and through, the conflict, whose function, historically speaking, will be held to have been that of preparing for the wider parliamentary issue which was to come, and who have constantly testified in their favour to the end. They are also indebted, hardly less so, albeit in a different sense, to those other members of the university who made of themselves the local and personal concentration and embodiment of professional

prejudice, and who did the movement the exceptional service, *quoad* the public mind, of enabling the case to be presented to Parliament, not only as a question of public policy and right, but as a case of private and personal injury, by the evasion on the part of a public body of an honourable engagement. And these obligations on the part of medical women have been continuous; for the University of Edinburgh, not content with obtaining a decision from the Court of Session that they had exceeded their powers in matriculating and undertaking to admit our five ladies to medical education and to their degree of M.D., and with saddling the complainants with all the costs, carried their opposition further into the High Court of Parliament itself, which they petitioned *not* to enable them, by a permissive enactment, to redeem their word.

"Both Senate and University Court, under the same signature of 'A. Grant, Principal,' petitioned the House of Commons against Mr. Cowper-Temple's enabling Bill: the Senate prayed that no legislation might take place until the subject had been inquired into by a Royal Commission or otherwise; the University Court was of opinion that so wide and important a question as the admission of women to academical degrees should not be referred for decision '*to small local boards*,' like the university courts of Scotland. In 1875, as I have shown, Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill was re-introduced, and the University Court again petitioned that the university might not be enabled and relieved, but that inquiry by a Royal Commission *or otherwise* should precede any attempt at legislation. In 1876 a Royal Commission on Scotch Universities was appointed, but the case of these lady students was refused a hearing. But the subject has been inquired into 'otherwise,' as prayed—inquired into as far as medical degrees are concerned, by Parliament itself, which has thought fit to 'enable' the University of Edinburgh in spite of itself. What use that 'local body' may now make of the powers which it has ended by obtaining, remains as yet, as far as my knowledge goes, neither decided nor ascertained.

"The part of the General Medical Council has been altogether different. That body could not but represent to a considerable extent the dislike of the profession to the invasion by women of their own preserves. But the Medical Council contains in large proportion the *élite* of the profession; and, what is perhaps more to the point, it contains a considerable admixture of men, the nature of whose practice has given them a wider acquaintance with the lay world, and with the data upon which legislation must practically be based, than falls to the lot of large numbers of the profession absorbed from the first in their local professional avocations, and unavoidably prone to exclusively professional views.

"The view the Medical Council was expressed in June 1875, when they reported to the Lord President that the 'Council are not prepared to say that women ought to be excluded from the profession.' Nothing could be more accurate, in my opinion, than this implied statement of the question, which was nothing less or other than this: 'Shall women be *excluded* by law?' And nothing could be wiser than their conclusion as the expression of opinion of a body responsible to the public for the whole medical profession of the country. That sentence was the *coup de grâce* to the medical, and indeed to all other, opposition to the women's claim. Had the Council taken a different view, the claim of the women might have been postponed and evaded for yet a little time; it could not, I believe, have been defeated. But now the concession is made with the assent of the great representative body of the profession, and that representative body is placed in altogether truer relations with Parliament and Government and public opinion than might otherwise have been the case; to the great benefit, in all probability, or its own future influence in legislation and administration. Her Majesty's Government has been marked in its deference to the Medical Council, and rightly so; for it is in the interests of the public as well as of the profession that Parliament and Government, in questions affecting a great profession, should be able to deal with it with the aid and intermediation of a body of men so distinguished and so competent, and with something of the training in life which is necessary to larger legislative views. The Government did well to act through such a body; and although Lord Sandon's help seemed from time to time to be given with a certain timidity and reserve, I willingly acknowledge the obligations in this matter of women to him, and, I should like to add, to Lord Beaconsfield, whose real interest in the subject, as a woman's question, I have not been able to doubt.

"Of the Royal Free Hospital, and of its chairman, what can I say more or better than that, in their own words, they have done that which was 'just and right,' save this also, that they have done it in the best way? We shall have a real experiment now, and a conclusive and convincing answer, for our time, to the question, 'Do women want this, or do they not?'

"One thing more remains to record. These pages will, I think, have presented to the reader's mind evidence of a tough and persistent and continuous struggle. Such struggles do not persist and succeed, according to my experience, without the accompanying fact, the continuous thread as it were, of one constant purpose and dominant will. Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake has made that greatest of all the contributions to the end attained. I do not say that she has been the ultimate cause of success. The ultimate cause has been simply this, that the time was at hand. It is one of the lessons of the history of progress that when the time for a reform has come you cannot resist it, though, if you make the attempt, what you may

do is to widen its character or precipitate its advent. Opponents, when the time has come, are not merely dragged at the chariot wheels of progress—they help to turn them. The strongest force, whichever way it seems to work, does most to aid. The forces of greatest concentration here have been, in my view, on the one hand the Edinburgh University, led by Sir Robert Christison, on the other the women claimants, led by Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake. Defeated at Edinburgh, she carried her appeal to the highest court, that most able to decide and redress, the High Court of Parliament representing the nation itself. The result we see at last. Those who hail it as the answer which they sought have both to thank, in senses and proportions which they may for themselves decide.—JAMES STANSFELD."

—*Nineteenth Century Review*, July 1877

NOTE PP, p. 232.

"At the last meeting of the London Obstetrical Society, Mrs. Garrett Anderson was proposed for election as a Fellow, but it was ruled that no woman could be admitted, although the bye-laws expressly declare 'every registered medical practitioner' to be eligible! This decision is the more edifying, as lady students and doctors have hitherto frequently been reproached with not paying sufficient attention to obstetric science, and as this very Society recently sent a deputation to Mr. Stansfeld urging to assist in organizing proper teaching and examination for midwives. The Society seems, however, now to be mainly bent on stamping out what it calls 'female practitioners,' and apparently trusts that when women learn that the honour and glory of its membership cannot be open to them, they will at once renounce the study of medicine. In the course of the discussion, the Society congratulated itself on the fact that Mrs. Anderson was the 'only qualified female practitioner' (which, by the bye, she is not), and that 'under existing regulations no other lady would be able to get on the Register.' One of the doctors present somewhat suspiciously protested that he had 'no fear of women being brought into the medical profession. The women of England would not go to female practitioners when they could get male practitioners.' Another gallantly remarked that if a woman were elected there would be a 'very large secession of members.' A third suggested that ladies might be admitted 'provided they could have a room to themselves,'—a plan which hardly seemed practical when there was but one lady in the question, but which might suggest to the non-professional mind whether it would not be well to follow out the idea in obstetric practice, by returning to the custom of old days, when the man-midwife, if employed at all, was kept in an outer room, and was summoned only in case of emergency. One only of the members present, Dr. Galton, suggested that, after all, the object of the Society was to advance obstetric medicine, and that it might be a mistake to exclude from it thoroughly educated women, whose observations and whose skill might redound to its credit. This view, however, was promptly negatived, and the Society gave in its formal adhesion to the most advanced principles of medical trade-unionism, by deciding that no woman could ever be allowed, with its sanction, to join in discussions concerning the treatment and relief of those sufferings which women alone have to endure!"—*Scotsman*, March 9, 1874.

NOTE QQ, p. 233.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE SOHO SQUARE HOSPITAL.

1. *To the Medical Committee.*

"GENTLEMEN,—As I see in your Report a special invitation to medical practitioners to avail themselves of the opportunities of study afforded by the Soho Square Hospital for Women, and as I am specially interested in that branch of medicine which exclusively concerns my own sex, I should be greatly obliged by your according me a general permission to visit your wards with the medical officers, and also to attend the practice of your out-patient department.

"Perhaps you will also kindly inform me of the usual hours for visits, for dispensary practice, and for operations.—I am, Gentlemen, yours obediently,

"SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE, M.D., L. & L.M., K.Q.C.P.I.

"32 BERNARD STREET, W.C., February 21st, 1878."

2. *From the Secretary of the Medical Committee.*

"Dear Madam,—In reply to your letter of the 24th inst. addressed to the Medical Committee of the Hospital for Women, requesting permission to visit the wards and out-patient department, I am desired by them to inform you they cannot accede to your request.

"I am, yours respectfully,

"Richard T. Smith, Hon. Sec., etc.

"March 1st, 1878."

3. *To the Chairman of the Hospital Committee.*

"My Lord,—Will you allow me to bring before you, as chairman of the Soho Square Hospital Committee, the following facts:—

"1. That in the published Report of that Hospital the medical staff expressly invite the visits of other practitioners who desire to study the branch of medicine specially practised there.

"2. That a fortnight ago I made application for permission to attend the hospital practice for the above object.

"3. That the Medical Committee have in reply sent me a curt refusal of that permission, without assigning any reason for so doing.

"4. That, as I am a duly qualified physician on the British Register, it is impossible to doubt that my exclusion from the desired opportunities of study can only depend on my belonging to the same sex as the patients for whose benefit the hospital is expressly designed.

"In conclusion, I beg to inquire whether it is your desire, and that of the Committee which you represent, that the only physicians debarred from the study in this Hospital of the special diseases of women should be those of the same sex as the sufferers, whose main duty in future life will be the treatment of maladies of this character.—I have the honour, my Lord, to remain, your obedient servant,

"Sophia Jex-Blake, M.D., L. & L.M., K.Q.C.P.I.

"March 5th, 1878."

4. *From the Secretary of the Hospital Committee.*

"Madam,—In reply to your letter of 5th inst., addressed to the Chairman of the Committee (the Marquis of Cholmondeley), which was duly laid before the Committee at their meeting yesterday, I am directed to forward you a copy of the following minute, viz: The Committee having had Miss Jex-Blake's application before them, together with the reply sent by the Medical Committee to a previous communication to the same effect, and carefully considered the same, resolved, that they are not prepared to take any action in the matter.—I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,

"David Cannon, *Secretary.*

"Hospital for Women, Soho Square,
March 22nd, 1878."

NOTE RR, p. 244.

It may be of interest to give the names of English women who have taken the degree of M.D. at Paris, Montpellier, Zurich, and Bern. All are also on the English Register except those whose names are given in italics.

University of France.—The ten English and Scotch women who have received the degree of M.D. are—Elizabeth Garrett (1870); *Emily Bovell* and Annie R. Barker (1877); Agnes M'Laren (1878); Matilda Chaplin Ayrton and Mary Marshall (1879); *Anna Kingsford* (1880); *Helen Bourchier* (1881); *F. Marie Waite* (1883); *Charlotte Ellaby* (1884).

University of Zurich.—Elizabeth Morgan (1870); Louisa Atkins and Eliza Walker (1872); Eliza M'Donogh (1877).

University of Bern.—Sophia Jex-Blake, Mary Edith Pechey (1877); Ann Clark (1878); Alice Ker (1879); Hope Adams (1880); Ann M'Call (1884); Elizabeth Bielby (1885).

INDEX TO NOTES.

—o—

Note		Page
A.	Objections to men doctors for certain cases,	49
B.	Suffering endured by women patients,	50
C.	Reply to Dr. Henry Bennet (*Lancet*),	52
D.	Need of medical women for convents,	53
E.	Women the natural doctors for women and babies,	54
F.	Articles on "Mixed class" question (*Daily Review*),	54
G.	Dr. M'Laren on Montpellier professors and students,	56
H.	Women nurses and women students in hospitals,	57
I.	Apothecaries' Hall device to exclude women,	58
J.	Results of Arts Examination, 1869 (Prof. Masson),	58
K.	Scandal caused by refusal of Hope Scholarship,	58
L.	"Shame upon thee, great Edina!"	61
M.	Protest of *Lancet* against Dr. Laycock,	62
N.	The Queen's alleged message to Dr. Christison,	62
O.	Application to Edinburgh Infirmary,	63
P.	"The Charge of the Five Hundred,"	65
Q.	Indignant letter from manly student (*Vir*),	66
R.	Petition of 23 men students to Infirmary managers,	67
S.	Committee for securing medical education for women,	68
T.	Medical men who petitioned in favour of women,	69
U.	Supposed "Libel" in *Craig* v. *Jex-Blake* case,	69
V.	Repayment of costs in Libel case,	70
W.	Letter from Miss Pechey about insults from students,	72
X.	The Song of the Neutral (*Scotsman*, Jan. 19, 1872),	73
Y.	Women students in the prize-lists, 1869-72,	73
Z.	Case for Counsel and Opinions upon it,	74
AA.	Devices of Medical Faculty about examinations,	76
BB.	"The Barrin' o' oor Door" (*Scotsman*, Feb. 13, 1872),	78
CC.	Notices of first edition of *Medical Women*,	80
DD.	Correspondence with University Court, 1871,	81
EE.	Expatriation or "Fight it out on this line,"	84
FF.	Classes taken in Edinburgh, 1869-74,	87
GG.	Petition from Lecturers of Extra-Mural School,	87
HH.	London School of Medicine for Women (1874 and 1886),	88
II.	Correspondence between Privy Council and General Medical Council,	91
JJ.	Protest by Dr. Anderson against different examinations,	92
KK.	Midwifery Licence of College of Surgeons,	93
LL.	Dangers respecting legislation for midwives,	94
MM.	Russell Gurney's Enabling Act, 1876,	95
NN.	Registered medical women, their Hospitals, etc., 1886,	95
OO.	*Resumé* of whole conflict, by Rt. Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P.,	96
PP.	Exclusion of Dr. Garrett Anderson from Obstetrical Society,	98
QQ.	Exclusion of Dr. Jex-Blake from Soho Square Hospital,	98
RR.	List of Englishwomen with foreign degrees (1886),	99

Now ready, uniform with 'Bits from Blinkbonny,'

Sixth Edition, in One Volume, cloth extra, with Six Original Illustrations price reduced to 3s. 6d.; or in plainer binding, without Illustrations, price 2s. 6d.,

Aldersyde. A Border Story of Seventy Years Ago. By Annie S. Swan.

The Authoress has received the following Autograph Letter from Mr. Gladstone:—

'10 Downing Street.
Whitehall, *April* 16, 1883.

'Dear Madam,—I have now read the work which you did me the honour to present to me with a very kind inscription, and I feel obliged to add a line to my formal acknowledgment already sent. I think it beautiful as a work of art, and it must be the fault of a reader if he does not profit by the perusal. Miss Nesbit and Marget will, I hope, long hold their places among the truly living sketches of Scottish character.—I remain your very faithful and obedient
W. E. GLADSTONE.'

'Sir Walter Scott himself never delineated a character more true to life than Janet Nesbit.'—*Stirling Observer.*

'Readers who can follow Scotch idioms easily will be moved by the narrative of Janet Nesbit's life. . . . Incidents common enough, but eloquent of character and well told.'—*Athenæum.*

'Full of quiet power and pathos.'—*Academy.*

'She has brought us into the presence of a pure and noble nature, and has reminded us that a life of sorrow and disappointments has its deep compensations, and its glorious meaning.'—*Literary World.*

'If there is anything more noteworthy than another in this cleverly constructed story, it is the vigorous raciness with which the vernacular is employed.'—*Haddington Courier.*

'A tale of deep interest; it is a work of true genius.'—*United Presbyterian Magazine.*

'Hurrah! our good Scotch stories, with their dear rough old vernacular, are not going to die out just yet, or, if at all, they are going to die hard.'—*S.S. Teachers' Magazine.*

'Beautifully conceived and exquisitely written.'—*Airdrie Advertiser.*

'One of the best Scotch tales that has appeared for many years. . . . A wealth of local colouring and fineness of touch rarely to be met in these days of painfully analytic writing.'—*Kilmarnock Herald.*

'A book we must read through at a sitting. It lays hold of our interest in the first page, and sustains it to the end.'—*Daily Review.*

'Deserves to occupy a prominent and permanent place among Scottish works of imagination. . . . Not a dull page in the book; while not a paragraph will be skipped lest some of the finer touches should be missed.'—*Kelso Chronicle.*

'We have not read a fresher, livelier, or more wholesomely stimulating story for many a day.'—*Kilmarnock Standard.*

'As a type of the sound-hearted, high-spirited Scottish gentlewoman, who can sustain her dignity on a poor pittance, and who is tender and true without any pretence of high sentiment, Janet Nesbit is a fine portrait of a noble woman.'—*N. B. Daily Mail.*

'The central figure in the narrative is Miss Janet Nesbit, of Aldersyde, a young gentlewoman who is early called to a life of self-sacrifice. This she humbly accepts, working out the problem with so much sincerity and faithfulness that the grey morning is followed by a bright day.'—*Christian Leader.*

Fifth Edition, in crown 8vo, cloth extra, with Six Illustrations in Chalk by Tom Scott, price reduced to 3s. 6d.; or in plainer binding, without Illustrations, price 2s. 6d.,

Carlowrie; or, Among Lothian Folk. By Annie S. Swan.

'A treat to the lovers of Scottish fiction, the scenery and local truth of the dialect and "modes of thought" are all that can be desired; and the book is no small addition to the literature which endeavours to depict a phase of country life fast passing away.'—*Athenæum.*

'Will certainly enhance the reputation of the authoress of "Aldersyde."'—*Liverpool Mercury.*

'The characters are sketched with more freedom and with more keenness also than those in "Aldersyde," and this comparison is just as severe a test as could be applied.'—*Daily Review.*

'The delineation of the house-mother, Mrs. Dalrymple, strikes us as being one of the very finest portraits to be found in the whole extent of our national literature of a clever, sunny-hearted, and utterly unselfish Scotchwoman of the rustic middle class.'—*Kilmarnock Journal.*

'The interest of the reader is enchained from first to last.'—*The Christian.*

'The book possesses a quiet idyllic charm which it is impossible to resist. . . . The breezy freshness and pervading refinement of the story will hardly fail to please all readers of simple tastes.'—*Academy.*

'"Carlowrie" is already one of the pronounced successes of the season. All the Scottish newspapers, with one characteristic exception, are delighted with this tale of the Lothians. That it is a study from the life, executed with the delicate insight that comes from loving sympathy, hardly admits of a doubt; and the delineation of the farmer's gentle wife—one of nature's true nobility—is a masterpiece of the purest pathos.'—*Christian Leader.*

'Of such stories as this—full of tender religious feeling, life-like characters, and graceful description—one cannot have too many.'—*Literary World.*

'A sweet idyl of rural life in a country farm.'—*Southern Reporter.*

'A healthy tone, and a Doric having the right twang in it.'—*Fifeshire Journal.*

'It is with choice taste, and an appropriateness rarely found in the inscription of a book, that Miss Swan dedicates her "Carlowrie" to the dear memory of her who made the sunshine of the home that was; and she may be well congratulated on her work as the book of the season.'—*National Literary Journal.*

'True to the life. . . . Interesting from beginning to end, and the reader must be hard to please who cannot find entertainment in what is at once a pleasant novel and a good book.'—*Northern Whig.*

'An episode of Midlothian life, so true in its local descriptions, so graphic in its character drawing, and so pure spirited withal, that the most fastidious critic will fall in love with it. . . . Parents of taste and intelligence will be glad to put such a book as this into the hands of their children.'—*Courant.*

Crown 8vo, cloth extra, Illustrated, price 3s. 6d.; plainer binding, without Illustrations, 2s. 6d.,

Preston Tower; or, Will He no' come Back Again?

By JESSIE M. E. SAXBY, Author of 'Ben Hanson,' etc.

'A capital story, with only so much flavour of religious teaching in it as to give it that quality which many parents and others think essential in all such works.'—*Scotsman.*

'Will be found specially interesting by those who are familiar with the scenery of East Lothian, some of the local descriptions being particularly good. . . . We have not forgotten Miss Saxby's story of "Ben Hanson," but the present volume seems to us full of greater power both in plot and incident.'—*Liverpool Mercury.*

'The tone of the book is morally healthy, its spirit evangelical, and in a quiet persuasive manner it inculcates lessons of the highest moment, and offers to young men counsels and warnings whose observance will not only save them from failure and disgrace, but insure to them success, honour, and the infinitely greater boon of eternal life.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'This is a romantic and pleasing story of family life and affection, which reminds us of a sentence by Edward Garrett, to the effect that "there is a certain misery which means, for the wise observer, that one of the other sex has been at the making of it."'—*Christian World.*

'A very readable romance of real life. . . . There is plenty of incident as well as character, and the author knows how to portray deep feeling in a simple, natural way.'—*Liverpool Courier.*

'The author of "Preston Tower" possesses abilities as a story-teller of a very high order. It is some time since we read a story of such good all-round merit.'—*Ardrossan Herald.*

'A quaint story, opening with an exceedingly graphic description of the village of Prestonpans, and presenting in the course of its clever plot a remarkable variety of typical characters, some of them "racy of the soil," and all of them people worth knowing.'—*Kilmarnock Standard.*

'The plot is good, and the hero is successful in getting out of the toils, and virtue is rewarded in the good old fashion.'—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

'The whole story throughout is beautifully told, and an exciting interest is awakened at the beginning, which feeling becomes more intense as the story proceeds, and which never flags till the last page is reached.'—*Huntly Express.*

'This is a Scotch tale of a very refreshing and wholesome nature. . . . The interest of the reader is aroused by the introduction of a thread of love, which takes its usual devious course, but ultimately triumphs.'—*Perthshire Constitutional.*

'The history of a young high-spirited youth, who engages in all kinds of mad escapades, and becomes at last an exile from home, serving with distinction in the Indian army, supplies the authoress with plenty of material for telling situations, thrilling scenes, and romantic incidents, and of this material she fully avails herself.'—*Northern Whig.*

'There is abundance of incident woven together into a well-contrived plot, and there is powerfully drawn character in this story, which is sure to interest, and can hardly be read without some advantage.'—*Spectator.*

Cr. 8vo, Illustrated, price 3s. 6d.; plainer binding, without Illustrations, 2s. 6d.,

At Any Cost. By Edward Garrett.

'There is a peculiar originality and force in everything that proceeds from the pen of this gifted writer; but in the present work she reaches an unusually high standard of excellence. . . . Edward Garrett is a great preacher, with more sound doctrine in her novelettes than is to be found in a good many sermons of the regulation pattern.'—*Greenock Telegraph.*

'The book contains a sketch of the career of two young lads from Shetland, who are both launched on the world of London to make their way as best they can. The one sets out with the fixed determination of "getting on," and lets no scruples of conscience or family affection stand in the way of this determination. The other, while also bent on succeeding in life, never loses sight of the obligations he owes to others, and keeps his heart pure, and his hands clean amid the manifold temptations of London life. . . . The whole book is one we would like to see in the hands of every boy and girl setting out in life, for there is much useful advice pleasantly and plainly given, and the lesson of the book is so plainly brought out that he who runs may read.' —*Aberdeen Journal.*

'Mr. Garrett is known as a writer with a good moral purpose in anything he undertakes, and the lesson inculcated in "At Any Cost" is a very necessary one in this age, when men are hasting to be rich by means not altogether scrupulous. The author traces the career of two youths who come from the far north to push their fortunes in London, and without bringing all kinds of misfortunes upon the head of the selfish one, he leaves his reader in no doubt as to which is the noble*r* life—that which places honour first, or that which worships wealth. The story is calculated to do good to the youth of both sexes.'—*Academy.*

'The tale is well told—the pathetic scenes being particularly well described—and cannot fail to exercise an ennobling influence on the mind.'—*Perthshire Constitutional.*

'From first to last the story is one of unusual interest, while its morally bracing tone is everything we could desire.'—*Liverpool Mercury.*

'Well written and extremely interesting, and is, in fact, a good illustration of the text, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon."'—*Nonconformist.*

'The story is altogether a very satisfactory one, and the characters are well drawn. The sincere religious tone which pervades it is of the sensible and practical sort, which does not degenerate into mere sentimentalism. The book belongs to a healthy class of fiction.'—*Scotsman.*

'Its literary merits are decidedly above the average, the characters being vividly defined and brightly portrayed. Nor is it without a welcome vein of sharp and humorous satire.'—*Graphic.*

'Shetland and London! very different places, and considerably far apart; but of course there are many Shetlanders in the great city, whether or not there be any Londoners in our Ultima Thule. These are the poles that are brought together in this attractive book. . . . The whole story is well worth reading, as it is written not only persuasively, so as to draw the ingenuous reader on and on, but also powerfully.'—*S. S.S. Teacher.*

'The treatment of the old bookseller, with his scepticism and pessimism, born of disappointment and the ill-doing of others, is excellent. "At Any Cost" is a good story in more ways than one.'—*Spectator.*

'A story of undoubted power, and fitted to give the young reader a true impulse toward a pure and noble life.'—*British Messenger.*

'This handsomely bound and beautifully illustrated volume will add to Mr. Garrett's already high reputation as a writer of fiction, which many will consider sufficient commendation of a first-rate story.'—*Brechin Advertiser.*

Accession no.

Author Jex-Blake, S.
Medical Women...

Call no. 19th cent
R692
J49
1886